

of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

679. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: Petition of W. A. Burton, Fannie Bell, S. Yarbrough, Mr. and Mrs. F. O. Springer, Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Fitzwater, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Leonard, jr., Mrs. Ella Smith, Mrs. F. E. Watson, Hy. Howell, John Ramo, and Gideon Hinkle, in opposition to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

680. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Bell, Mrs. Minnie Thomas, Mrs. Ethel Manken, Mrs. Geneva Manken, et al., in opposition to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

681. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by Wilson Janis and other residents of Kyle, S. Dak., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

682. Also, petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by F. B. Sherwood and other residents of Cottonwood, S. Dak., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

683. Also, petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by Stanley Beck and other residents of Wasta, S. Dak., and vicinity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

684. Also, petition of numerous citizens of McLaughlin, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; also petition of numerous citizens of Perkins County, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

685. Also, petition of certain residents of Lead and Central City, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

686. Also, petition of certain residents of Lawrence County, S. Dak., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

687. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of certain citizens of Little River County, Ark., against enactment of any Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

688. By Mr. WOOD: Petition signed by residents of Tippecanoe County, Ind., protesting against the adoption by Congress of the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

689. By Mr. WURZBACH: Petition of Pauline Montimore, and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 (compulsory Sunday observance bill); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

690. Also, petition of Thomas J. Dilwood and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 (compulsory Sunday observance bill); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

691. Also, petition of Thos. P. Hamm, Mrs. P. E. Carter, and other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78 (compulsory Sunday observance bill); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

692. Also, petition of Blanche Ricker, D. H. Howell, A. Haughton, and other citizens, of Corpus Christi, Tex., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

693. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Charles W. Stultz, Herman Barkdall, and others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

694. Also, petition of John H. C. Smith, Charles R. Smith, Amos Hurd, and others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

695. Also, petition of C. C. Colliflower, Martha Williams, Nelia Glenn, and others, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, January 5, 1928

The Chaplain, Rev. Z<sup>2</sup>Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning, send out Thy light and Thy truth that they may lead us. As the duties of another day await us we would thank Thee for Thy loving care of us, for Thy gifts of health and strength, and for the companionship of friends with minds made reverent by honest thought. Give us new hopes and cares which may supplant our own too small concerns. Make us too great for narrow creeds of right and

wrong, which fade before our unslaked thirst for good, and grant us peace serene, through Him who is the Prince of Peace, our Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dill	King	Sackett
Barkley	Edge	La Follette	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	McKellar	Shipstead
Bingham	Fess	McLean	Shortridge
Black	Fletcher	McMaster	Smoot
Blaine	Frazier	McNary	Steak
Blaise	George	Mayfield	Steiwer
Borah	Gerry	Metcalf	Swanson
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Thomas
Brookhart	Greene	Neely	Tydings
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Tyson
Bruce	Harris	Norris	Wagner
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Hawes	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hayden	Overman	Waterman
Couzens	Hedin	Pine	Watson
Curtis	Howell	Pittman	Wheeler
Cutting	Johnson	Ransdell	Willis
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	
Deneen	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is but one measure on the calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection to that arrangement, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE OF COMMERCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the general secretary of the International Parliamentary Conference of Commerce, dated Brussels, November 1, 1927, inviting Congress to be represented at the fourteenth general assembly of the conference to be held on the 19th of June next and following days at the Palais du Sénat, at Paris, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### COL. CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter of congratulation from the presiding officer of the Hungarian Parliament with respect to the transatlantic flight of Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State relative to suggestion of candidates for the Nobel peace prize to be laid before the Nobel committee of the Norwegian Parliament, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with an accompanying report of withdrawals and restorations of public lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

### CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the board of actuaries of the civil-service retirement and disability fund, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

### PURCHASE OF DESIGNS, AIRCRAFT, AIRCRAFT PARTS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, the price paid therefor, the

reason for the award in each case, and the names and addresses of all competitors in the various competitions held by the Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the joint committee's operations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### OFFICERS DELINQUENT IN RENDERING ACCOUNTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the Comptroller General of the United States, submitted pursuant to law, showing officers who were delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts to the proper offices in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, the cause therefor and whether the delinquency was waived, together with a list of such officers who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found to be indebted to the Government and had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### SETTLEMENT OF SHIPPING BOARD CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement from October 16, 1926, to October 15, 1927, by the United States Shipping Board and/or the United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### P. L. ANDREWS CORPORATION v. THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 38)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion filed by the court in the cause of the P. L. Andrews Corporation v. The United States, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. McLEAN presented the following joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Senate Joint Resolution 36, requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates

#### Resolved by this assembly—

Whereas by the provisions of the Federal revenue act of 1926, which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, this State is being subjected to a form of coercion in order to compel the imposition of State death taxes at rates higher than its citizens desire to impose upon themselves for their own needs and benefit; and

Whereas any form of coercion, or financial inducement to States, by Federal authority is in distinct conflict with the spirit of our constitutional government, is offensive to sound policy, and is destructive of the responsibility of citizens and of States with respect to the power to levy taxes, the most vital of the powers which inhere in government; and

Whereas joint levies of taxes by the Federal Government on the one hand and by the States of the Union on the other hand, are unprecedented in the history of this country, and are particularly offensive when the Federal enactment operates in any way to influence or control the exercise of sovereignty by the respective States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the judgment of the general assembly that the Congress of the United States should forthwith repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which impose taxes on the estates of deceased persons, leaving this field of taxation exclusively to the States of the Union in times of peace; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States, and they are hereby requested to spread these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to select such other means as may be appropriate to apprise the Senators and Representatives of other States of the contents hereof.

Approved April 29, 1927.

#### STATE OF CONNECTICUT,

##### Office of the Secretary, ss:

I, Francis A. Pallotti, secretary of the State of Connecticut, and keeper of the seal thereof, and of the original record of the acts and resolutions of the general assembly of said State, do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of the resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of the revenue act of 1926 which pertain to the taxation of estates with the original record of the same now remaining in this office, and have found the said copy to be a correct and complete transcript thereof.

And I further certify that the said original record is a public record of the said State of Connecticut, now remaining in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said State, at Hartford, this 22d day of November, 1927.

[SEAL.]

FRANCIS A. PALLOTTI, Secretary.

Mr. McLEAN also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Greenwich, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation prohibiting the sending of unsolicited merchandise through the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from Nathan Hale Camp, No. 1, and Admiral Foote Camp, No. 17, both Sons of Veterans, U. S. A., of New Haven, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation to transform the old Ford Theater, in the city of Washington, into a museum to house the Lincoln relics recently purchased by the Government, and to provide a meeting place for the Grand Army of the Republic and its auxiliary organizations, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions from sundry citizens of Hartford, New Haven, and New London, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation restoring to the medical profession the right to prescribe any form of intoxicating liquor to patients and in any quantity which their professional judgment may dictate, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GREENE presented resolutions adopted by the board of selectmen of the town of Alburg, Vt., favoring the passage of legislation authorizing the construction and operation by the Gulf Coast Properties (Inc.) of a bridge across Lake Champlain, connecting the towns of Alburg, Vt., and Rouses Point, N. Y., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Seattle, Wash., praying for the repeal of the United States marine inspection laws controlling the operation of steam vessels, their captains and crews, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ferndale and King County, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PROTECTION OF WATERSHEDS OF NAVIGABLE STREAMS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read from the clerk's desk and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a telegram, to which I would like the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. McNARY].

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., January 4, 1928—10.40 p. m.

Senator M. M. NEELY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Our organization has previously indorsed the McNary-Woodruff bill, which comes up before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to-day. This means much to West Virginia. The Monongahela National Forest will benefit. We urge that you see that this communication is placed in the hands of the committee to-day to be placed on record.

THOMAS W. SKUCE,

Secretary West Virginia Association of Foresters.

#### THE DIRECT-PRIMARY SYSTEM

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the National Grange at its recent annual convention, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted at the annual convention of the National Grange, Cleveland, Ohio, November 17, 1927

Whereas the enemies of popular government have for years been making a nation-wide campaign to discredit and repeal the direct-primary system of making nominations for public office; and

Whereas there is no argument against the primary system that can not be used with equal force against our system of conducting general elections: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Grange in session at Cleveland, believing in the fundamental principles of Americanism, pledges its hearty support to the maintenance of the primary system.



## REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. EDGE, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, to which was referred the bill (S. 1946) relative to the pay of certain retired warrant officers and enlisted men and warrant officers and enlisted men of the reserve forces of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, fixed under the terms of the Panama Canal act, as amended, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1256) to amend the Penal Code of the Canal Zone, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 8) thereon.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 21, 1927, that committee presented to the President of the United States an enrolled bill and enrolled joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220);

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2256) authorizing the President to order Clifton E. High, late first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army, before a retiring board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 2257) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River near Wetumpka, Elmore County, Ala.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYSON:

A bill (S. 2258) to give war-time rank to certain officers on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILL (by request):

A bill (S. 2259) granting first preference to World War veterans in all departments of the Government; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2260) granting a pension to Peter Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2261) for the relief of Edna B. Erskine;  
A bill (S. 2262) to refund \$927 to the Architectural League of New York;

A bill (S. 2263) for the relief of A. R. Free; and  
A bill (S. 2264) for the relief of Ollie Keeley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2265) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bruno; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2266) to amend an act entitled "An act placing certain noncommissioned officers in the first grade," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2267) authorizing the granting of pensions to dependents of the officers and men who lost their lives by the sinking of the United States submarines S-51 and S-4 in twice the amount due under existing law in each case; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2268) for the relief of William Zeiss, administrator of William B. Reaney, survivor of Thomas Reaney and Samuel Archbold; and

A bill (S. 2269) for the relief of Alice Hipkins; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2270) granting an increase of pension to Carrie E. Costinett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 2271) to permit the admission, as nonquota immigrants, of certain alien wives and children of United States citizens; to the Committee on Immigration.

A bill (S. 2272) to amend section 4132, as amended, of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PINE:

A bill (S. 2273) to refer the claims of the loyal Creek Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2274) for the relief of William H. Chambliss; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2275) granting compensation to Wallace B. Bogart; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 2276) authorizing the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a national home for soldiers and sailors of all wars; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2277) relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 2278) to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers and real-estate salesmen; to create a real-estate commission in the District of Columbia, and to provide a penalty for a violation of the provisions thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2279) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase certain lands in the city of Bismarck, Burleigh County, N. Dak., for Indian school purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2280) to authorize the coinage of Longfellow 1-cent pieces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2281) granting a pension to Imogene Ellsworth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2282) granting a pension to Mary E. Truesdale (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2283) for the relief of Belle Piper Miller; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOULD:

A bill (S. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Thurston (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2285) granting a pension to August Rieke (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2286) granting a pension to Frank Schwartz (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2287) granting a pension to Hannah Case (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2288) authorizing the payment of war-risk insurance to Bertha M. Smith; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2289) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Minnesota, the bell formerly on the old cruiser *Minneapolis*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2290) for the relief of Regina Schoor; and  
A bill (S. 2291) for the relief of certain seamen who are judgment creditors of the Black Star Line (Inc.) for wages earned; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2292) providing for the employment of certain civilian assistants in the office of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and fixing salaries of certain officials; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. SACKETT:

A bill (S. 2293) to authorize the construction of a George Rogers Clark Memorial Lighthouse on the Ohio River at, or adjacent to, the city of Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 2294) to amend the first paragraph of section 7 of the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1925; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLEASE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to prohibit the intermarriage of certain races; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FESS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 66) authorizing an additional appropriation to be used for the memorial building provided for by a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution in relation to a monument to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States of America, its insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War," approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to take action relative to adjustment of freight rates upon export grain and grain products moved by common carriers subject to the interstate commerce act, and the fixing of rates and charges; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. CAPPER, the Committee on Finance was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1706) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRAZIER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 for the relief of distress among the needy Indians of the Turtle Mountain Band, North Dakota, intended to be proposed by him to the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1929, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION OF AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. WHEELER. I send to the desk a resolution and ask that the clerk may read it.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 102), as follows:

Whereas the executive branches of this Government have been and are now carrying on a war in Nicaragua without the Congress of the United States first having declared war as is provided by the provisions of Article I of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas American boys connected with the Marine Corps of this Government are being killed in said warfare so being made and carried on in violation of the Constitution because of mismanagement and inadequate protection being afforded them; and

Whereas it is claimed by the executive branches of our Government that said boys are in Nicaragua to protect American investments and concessions in said country; and

Whereas the claim has been made that some of the investments are based on concessions obtained by questionable and unconscionable methods owing to the lack of capital in the Republic of Nicaragua; and

Whereas such investments and concessions, if unjust in their terms endanger legitimate business not only in Nicaragua but in other foreign countries; and

Whereas American investments abroad, already amounting to many billions of dollars, are increasing rapidly and controversies regarding the rights and duties of holders of such concessions constitute an increasingly important part of our foreign relations and produce tensions which may easily lead to war; and

Whereas statements purporting to be issued by the executive branches of our Government, or by the spokesman for the White House, were published in the newspapers of the country to the effect that our armed forces in Nicaragua were to be strictly neutral as between the contending forces in that country; and

Whereas subsequent events clearly show that our armed forces have not acted as neutrals but have taken an active part in a controversy wholly within and affecting solely the rights of the people of a friendly nation in defiance of every fundamental principle upon which this Government was founded: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to investigate the terms and conditions under which concessions have been procured in Nicaragua by United States citizens and by corporations and other associations in which United States citizens are financially interested, and the nature and extent of such concessions, with particular reference to (1) the source and sanction of such concessions, and (2) the principal aspects of public policy involved in the treatment, as property rights for purposes of diplomatic protection of such concessions.

*Resolved further*, That the said Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to investigate who ordered the marines to be sent to Nicaragua, why they were sent there, why they have been kept there, why they have not acted as neutrals, whether or not it is the purpose of the executive branches of our Government to continue to usurp the power of Congress given it by the Constitution of the United States, namely, the power to declare war, and any other matter or thing which to the committee or a subcommittee thereof may seem meet and proper in the premises.

For the purposes of this resolution such committee or subcommittee is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of such committee or subcommittee shall not exceed \$30,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee. Such committee or subcommittee shall make a final report to the Senate as to its findings.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations at this time, but I give notice that at a later date I shall have something further to say concerning the resolution and the situation in Nicaragua.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JANIE HARRIS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 103), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Janie Harris, widow of Albert Harris, late a waiter in the employ of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE THE PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 104), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventieth Congress to send for persons, books and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed 25 cents per 100 words; to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—CHESTER R. HOPPER

Mr. COPELAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to return to Chester R. Hopper the affidavits and papers filed by him in connection with the bill for his relief, being the bill (S. 1009) granting a pension to Chester R. Hopper, which failed of passage in the Sixty-ninth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions and act:

On December 21, 1927:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

On December 27, 1927:

S. 1397. An act amending section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act approved November 17, 1921 (ch. 124, 42 Stat. L. 220).

#### CLAIM OF NORWAY FOR REPRESENTATION OF AMERICAN INTERESTS IN MOSCOW (S. DOC. NO. 37)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway for the payment of interest on certain sums advanced by it for this Government in connection with its representation of American interests in Moscow, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 5, 1928.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.



## EIGHTH INTERNATIONAL DAIRY CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 36)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State concerning participation by the Government of the United States in the Eighth International Dairy Congress, which will be held in Great Britain in June-July, 1928, under the patronage of His Majesty King George V.

Concurring in the view of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture, as stated in the report, I request of Congress legislation authorizing acceptance of the invitation of the British Government to the Government of the United States to appoint delegates to that congress, and an appropriation of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses of delegates.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 5, 1928.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] has asked to be relieved from further service upon the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions. I ask that an order to that effect may be entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] may be assigned to service upon the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also ask that the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] may be assigned to the minority vacancy upon the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] asks to be relieved from further service upon the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] be assigned to the minority vacancy upon the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TRIDINGS] be assigned to the minority vacancy upon the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] be assigned to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE TARIFF

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. McMASTER on December 13, 1927, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the United States Senate favors an immediate lowering of tariff schedules, and tariff legislation, embodying lowered schedules, should be considered and enacted during the present session of Congress; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over until Monday without prejudice, and that it be taken up Monday for disposition.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I will say in regard to the request of the Senator from Kansas that a number of Senators who are interested in the resolution deem it advisable that it shall go over until Monday. Therefore, I gladly accede to the request of the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ARTICLE BY HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is an article in Current History for September, 1927, written by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], entitled "Dollar diplomacy in Latin America," which shows a great deal of research and

gives a great deal of valuable information. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

## "DOLLAR DIPLOMACY" IN LATIN AMERICA

By HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

The Monroe doctrine is dead, and has been dead for many years. It lived only as long as its original spirit was followed. That spirit was the protection of human liberty. It was departed from by the United States in her policy toward Latin America fully 25 years ago. To-day the Monroe doctrine remains only as a diplomatic subterfuge. Its ideals are being used as a cloak to cover acts subversive of human liberty and contrary to the institutions and traditions of our Nation.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century new political principles were challenging the existing order of society. The thirteen American Colonies had revolted against the European monarchical system; the French Revolution had thrown down a firebrand into the heart of Europe itself; and in Central and South America republicanism was advancing by leaps and bounds. This new confession of political faith which was overturning the world was best expressed in our great Declaration of Independence, wherein it is stated that we dedicate ourselves and the soil of America to the principle that governments receive their powers "only from the consent of the governed."

The treaty of the Holy Alliance had been signed by the leading monarchs of Europe with the main objective of building a barricade against the spread of this new theory of government. President Monroe and other American statesmen of the time looked upon this alliance, with its determination to maintain and extend the European colonial system, as a threat against the freedom of the whole western continent.

Accordingly there was enunciated a policy on behalf of the United States Government to the effect that any attempt on the part of European powers to interfere with the governments of our sister Republics in the western continent would be met with the armed resistance of the United States. In the same message President Monroe stated clearly what was to be the relation of the United States toward these Republics. "It is still the true policy of the United States," he said, "to leave the parties—the sister Republics—to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course."

This was the famous Monroe doctrine. No statement of public policy has ever at its inception been more purely and unselfishly dedicated to a political ideal. It has been restated again and again, by successive Presidents and Secretaries of State. For instance, John W. Foster, Secretary of State in Harrison's Cabinet, in an address entitled "Misconceptions and Limitations of the Monroe Doctrine" before the American Society of International Law, said: "If the Monroe doctrine did not contain a high moral principle of ethics and government which commanded the respect of all civilized nations we could not build a Navy vast enough nor create an Army large enough to enforce it against the hostile sentiment of the great powers of Europe."

During the past 25 years, however, much confusion has arisen regarding this historic policy, even in the minds of the statesmen who were conducting it. President Wilson, addressing the Southern Commercial Congress at Mobile on October 27, 1913, said, in speaking of the Latin-American Republics:

"They have had harder bargains driven with them in the matter of loans than any other people in the world. Interest has been exacted of them that was not exacted of anybody else, because the risk was said to be greater; and then securities were taken that destroyed the risk. An admirable arrangement for those who were forcing the terms. I rejoice in nothing so much as in the prospect that they will now be emancipation from these conditions, and we ought to be the first to take part in assisting in that emancipation. \* \* \* We must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor. \* \* \* Human rights, national integrity and opportunity as against material interests—that is the issue which we now have to face. \* \* \* We must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material interests made superior to human liberty and national opportunity."

On August 30, 1923, Charles Evans Hughes, then Secretary of State in the Harding Cabinet, in an address before the American Bar Association assembled in convention in Minneapolis, made these high professions:

"The Monroe doctrine does not attempt to establish a protectorate over Latin-American states. \* \* \* I utterly disclaim as unwarranted the observations which occasionally have been made implying a claim on our part to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics, to assert an overlordship, to consider the spread of our authority beyond our own domain as the aim of our policy, and to make our power the test of right in this hemisphere. I oppose all such misconceived and unsound assertions and intimations. They do not express our national purpose; they belie our sincere friendship; they are false to the fundamental principles of our institutions and of our foreign policy, which has sought to reflect, with rare exceptions, the ideals of

liberty; they menace us by stimulating a distrust which has no real foundation. They find no sanction whatever in the Monroe doctrine. There is room in this hemisphere, without danger of collision, for complete recognition of that doctrine and the independent sovereignty of the Latin-American Republics."

What was the cause of the last two rather heated restatements of the spirit of the Monroe doctrine? What had been done since the lofty expressions of John W. Foster to call forth the above indictment from President Wilson or the violent protest of Mr. Hughes?

#### PRESIDENT TAFT'S VIEW

Viallate, in his *Economic Imperialism* (p. 62), quotes William Howard Taft, who in the meantime had also been President, as stating our Latin-American policy as follows:

"While our policy should not be turned a hairbreadth from the straight path of justice, it may well be made to include *intervention to secure for our merchants and our capitalists opportunity for profitable investments which shall inure to the benefit of both countries.*" (Senate hearings on "Foreign loans," p. 86. The italics are mine.)

It is to Theodore Roosevelt that we must look for a solution of this apparent contradiction of aims and policies. Under President Roosevelt the spirit of the Monroe doctrine suffered a fundamental change. Until his administration the European powers had been left free to collect their own loans and protect their own nationals and property in the Latin-American countries. For over 80 years European governments had from time to time bombarded Latin-American ports and landed troops on Latin-American territory to enforce settlement of disputes; and our diplomacy had always allowed a reasonable time to elapse before the Monroe doctrine was strictly applied. One of the chief results of this was that the enmity of the Latin-American Republics rested on the direct aggressors.

But President Roosevelt initiated the policy of making the United States the "policeman of the Western Continent." The assumption which he raised was that it was our duty to use the military forces of the United States to insure the settlement of all disputes in Latin America and to protect European as well as American life and property there if they were endangered; that if we did not do so the European powers would come in, would stay permanently on the Western Continent, and so would threaten our national safety. The Monroe doctrine was stretched to cover this new policy. At once Latin-American enmity began to rest on the United States alone, since we were the policeman in all difficulties.

Obviously the Roosevelt policy itself was nothing but an indication of a fundamental change in our own attitude toward Latin America. From this it was only a logical step to the policy of President Taft, Roosevelt's successor—"intervention to secure for our merchants and our capitalists opportunity for profitable investments."

At the beginning of President Wilson's first administration we had made such progress in this direction and the Monroe doctrine had been stretched so far that John Callan O'Laughlin, First Assistant Secretary of State under President Roosevelt and at present editor of the *Army and Navy Journal*, could say in his *Imperiled America*:

"We are seeking to make and we proudly call the Caribbean Sea an American lake. \* \* \* We are maintaining a financial protectorate over Santo Domingo. We are applying the same system to Haiti and Nicaragua and have arranged for the purchase of the Danish West Indies. We kept a dictator out of Venezuela and drove another out of Nicaragua."

It is interesting to compare these various interpretations of the Monroe doctrine with what our Latin-American policy actually has been at the times they were uttered and under the men who were uttering them. Mr. O'Laughlin states the case correctly for the day in which he was speaking. President Wilson, in spite of his fair words at Mobile, did nothing to arrest and everything to sustain the very policy in Latin America against which he was protesting. Mr. Hughes's policy will be referred to later. In terms of deeds, not words, our course in Latin America has advanced without a single deviation along the channel laid down for it by Presidents Roosevelt and Taft.

At the present time, instead of maintaining "financial protectorates" over our sister Republics in Latin America, it would be more correct to say that we are holding them under a form of military and financial dictatorship. These various military and financial dictatorships have been imposed upon the Latin-American countries under successive administrations and by the force of American arms since 1909 up to and including the present day.

In the case of the Dominican Republic we began by placing over her a military government under United States auspices, supported by the United States marines, with a lieutenant commander of the Navy as the "officer administering the affairs of finance and commerce for the military government." To secure payment of six different American loans, the first in 1907 and the last in 1922 and a seventh loan in 1924, "a specific charge on the customs revenues" was made, these revenues to be "collected during the life of the bonds by an official appointed by the President of the United States." The "agreement" by which the revenues of the Dominican Republic were thus laid under mortgage was

made between the United States and the United States controlled military government in Santo Domingo, the bond issue bearing the guaranties of the military government as an "irrevocable obligation of the Dominican Republic." (Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, hearing before subcommittee on foreign loans, Exhibits 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, et seq.)

#### MILITARY RULE IN SANTO DOMINGO

A provisional government was established in Santo Domingo by the military governor, United States Admiral Robison, on October 21, 1922, to provide for holding elections and reorganizing the government. On July 12, 1924, Gen. Horacio Vasquez, elected President for four years, was inaugurated. The convention between the United States and the new Vasquez government stipulated that all acts of the United States military for the past 17 years be ratified; all American loans be assumed as public debt, including a sinking-fund issue bearing 9 to 18 per cent interest; and a new refunding loan be accepted running up to \$25,000,000. The customs receivership was extended until all loans were paid. Thus liberty in our sister Republic of Santo Domingo has a new birth under a fresh mortgage of her public revenues to American bankers, subject to foreclosure by intervention of the United States marines at any time when the public revenues fall short of bond and interest requirements.

We entered Haiti with our marines in 1915, during a revolution, under Wilson's first administration. The excuse under which we acted was that of restoring order in the country. By 1916 we had advanced so far with this program that the legislative body of the Haitian Government was dissolved and deputies and senators were forcibly expelled by American marines, after which the legislative palace was padlocked. Shortly afterwards an election was held under American auspices and a Senate and Chamber of Deputies more to our liking were elected. The first duty of this new Congress was to adopt a new constitution. The American legation made specific recommendations as to clauses in this new constitution, and these were duly handed to the members of the new Congress by the new Haitian Government.

These "suggestions," however, were not universally adopted by the new Congress; and again, in June of 1917, gendarmes under the command of a United States officer of marines invaded the legislative palace.

The files were looted and all records pertaining to the work already done by the Congress were taken away. Deputies and Senators were expelled, the legislative palace was once more padlocked, and a military guard was sent to prevent the reassembling of the legislators.

Then, in 1918, a constitution for Haiti was drafted in Washington and forwarded to Haiti to be submitted to a vote of the people. A farcical "plebiscite" was held, with United States marine officers in command of gendarmes running the polling; blue ballots were for and red ballots were against, and the Haitian people, now thoroughly intimidated, were told to cast blue ballots. The American-written constitution was adopted by a vote of 99,000 to some scattering few hundreds in opposition.

This constitution, now in force, provides for the election of the President and of the members of Congress by the people. It states that the election shall be called by the President on an even-numbered year, but does not specify what year. The constitution also provides that until an election is called the legislative authority shall be vested in a council of state composed of 21 members, all of whom are appointed by the President. This council of state is given authority to choose a President in case no popular election is held. Up to date no even-numbered year has been found in which to hold an election, although nearly 10 years have elapsed since the constitution went into force. All efforts on the part of patriotic Haitians to obtain a popular election have failed. The same President, Borno, is elected by the council of state year after year, he having himself appointed the council of state which elects him.

This Haitian incident gives an excellent cross-section of what our Latin-American policy has actually become. Under President Wilson, who said "we must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor," we entered Haiti by force, twice dissolved her legislative assembly at the point of the gun, wrote a constitution and forced it upon the Haitian people, and set up on Haitian soil a government contrary to all the principles of political freedom. This policy was in turn denounced by President Harding, but was carried on by him without change. It was being actively carried on by the State Department at the moment that Secretary of State Hughes was saying: "I utterly disclaim, as unwarranted, the observations which occasionally have been made implying a claim on our part to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics, to assert an overlordship, to consider the spread of our authority beyond our own domains as the aim of our policy, and to make our power the test of right in this hemisphere."

#### FINANCIAL DICTATORSHIP

South American Republics have not escaped the net of American financial dictatorship. In Bolivia, on May 31, 1923, an issue of \$33,000,000 of 25-year 8 per cent bonds was contracted to New York



bankers, secured by a mortgage on all public revenues as well as by stock of the Bolivia National Bank, with this unique redemption feature: "This bond is redeemable \* \* \* on or after May 1, 1937, and not before, at the rate of 105 per cent of its par value and accrued interest." Bolivia's public revenues were, under the contract, placed in the control of a commission of three men, two of whom, including the chairman, were American bankers. A telegram from the United States Secretary of State certified to the execution of the instrument. (Exhibits 4, 5, 6, "Foreign loans" subcommittee, 1925-26.)

The case of the Salvador 1923 loan is only another illustration. The details are reported by the New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle (October 13 and 16, 1923), the Diario Oficial of El Salvador (February 20, 1923), and in the Senate committee hearings on "Foreign loans" (Exhibits 1, 2, 3, "Foreign loans" subcommittee, 1925-26). In that year Salvador contracted for new bond issues aggregating \$18,500,000, at 8 per cent and 7 per cent, respectively, for American loans and 6 per cent for a smaller British sterling loan. Secretary Hughes on October 16, 1923, issued the following statement defining the official relations of the State Department to the loan contract in question:

"The Department of State has no relation to the matter except with respect to facilitating the arbitration and determination of disputes that may arise between the parties and the appointment of a collector of customs in case of default. \* \* \* The Secretary of State has consented to use his good offices in referring such disputes to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. \* \* \* Also, at the request of the Government of Salvador and the interested bankers, the Secretary of State has consented to assist in the selection of the collector of customs. \* \* \* The contract also provides that the collector of customs, if appointed, will communicate to the Department of State for its records such regulations relating to the customs administration as may be prescribed, and also a monthly and annual report."

This means in plain terms that the Secretary of State, 60 days after his Minneapolis speech denying any "claim on our part to superintend the affairs of our sister Republics," himself takes over the superintendence of the customs revenues of the Republic of Salvador. Six millions of the above-mentioned bonds were sold to the President of the United Fruit Co. at 88 per cent of par value, according to the contract approved by the State Department. Commenting on the whole transaction the Diario Oficial of El Salvador states that President Molina at first withheld his approval "because of the clauses robbing Salvador of her financial autonomy." But at length, through public need in Salvador and pressure on the part of the United States, the contract was signed—on the centenary of the signing of the Monroe doctrine.

The situation in Nicaragua, lately much in the public eye, is the same as elsewhere in Latin America, with several flagrant features of its own. The excuse of protecting our canal-route concessions in Nicaragua is made the justification for controlling by force the internal affairs of that country, although no party or individual in Nicaragua has ever proposed to violate those concessions, and no sane man supposes that they could be violated by any Nicaraguan Government. Behind all this is a shadow of financial intrigue and imposition so shameful that American public opinion would instinctively repudiate our Nicaraguan policy if the facts were widely known. These facts are a matter of record in the Senate Hearings on Nicaragua, 1914, and on Foreign Loans, 1927.

Instances could be multiplied indefinitely; any well-informed American citizens is now aware that our present Latin-American policy is frankly one of economic aggression involving political dictatorship. It is still covered by the name of the Monroe doctrine, but it has nothing in common with that doctrine as originally enunciated. In Costa Rica, Honduras, and Guatemala, as well as in the countries already mentioned, the American financial protectorate is based on the same general methods. American banking and bonding interests, trading corporations, public utilities, hemp and timber concessions, represent the principal enterprises for which our Federal Government practices "dollar diplomacy" in Latin America. The State Department acts as commercial agency and diplomatic referee. The Navy Department furnishes and directs the United States marines to enforce the terms of the contract. The customs revenues of the various Republics are the principal securities for American loans and investments, and the levying and collection of these funds are placed in the hands of agents either directly or indirectly responsible to the United States Government.

#### BENEFITS TO LATIN AMERICA

I am well aware of certain material advantages which we have brought about in Latin America during the past 25 years; I can from personal observation testify to the good roads, the harbor improvements, the sanitary betterment and the great work we have done in the elimination of preventable disease. But this is not the real question. If such things have not been achieved by the Latin-American countries themselves, and if they have been bought at the price of liberty and freedom, they are not worth while and will not endure.

The danger exists not only for Latin America but quite as clearly for our own institutions at home. Since when have we entertained the pernicious theory that we must lift all neighboring countries to our own standards of life by military force and political control if need be? The moment that theory is actually accepted by the United States we shall have lost the cause for which the American Revolution was fought and in whose name our Republic came into being as a Nation. The country that denies freedom abroad has lost freedom at home.

Old-fashioned as it may seem, I still believe in the principles of human liberty. I still believe that the only way for humanity to advance is for the different unit-peoples all over the world to be left to govern themselves. I still believe that right and justice as between nations can not only be professed but can actually be practiced. I still believe in honest diplomacy, in doing what you promise, in calling a spade a spade.

In the case of the Monroe doctrine we must do one of two things. Either we must abandon the idealism of the Monroe doctrine altogether, acknowledging frankly what our acts are in Latin America and accepting the consequences both at home and abroad, or we must revive the idealism of the Monroe doctrine, cleave to it in deeds as in words, and make our acts square with our professions.

It is a moral issue of first proportions. But moral issues work themselves out in practical results.

The question before us is, Can we afford, in dollars and cents, to pursue our present policy in Latin America much longer? Has "dollar diplomacy" really paid, in terms of national gain? It undoubtedly has paid well for a few interests and individuals. But does all this actually pay to the general commercial enterprise of the Nation? The following statistics for 1925 and 1926 are taken from the monthly summary of the Department of Commerce for the year ended December, 1926:

United States exports to—	Calendar year		Change (percent)
	1925	1926	
Mexico.....	\$144,720,323	\$134,994,164	-7
Costa Rica.....	6,800,819	6,312,416	-7
Honduras.....	9,569,937	7,540,286	-21
Nicaragua.....	7,434,339	5,264,272	-15
Salvador.....	9,193,916	9,556,521	+4
Cuba.....	198,655,032	160,487,680	-19
Dominican Republic.....	17,763,577	14,572,376	-18
Haitian Republic.....	13,711,585	10,857,427	-22
Total.....	407,849,726	350,585,142	-14

Thus, granting that the activities of the State Department and the employment of the United States marines have brought profits to perhaps a score of our leading industrial and financial interests, what is the gain to the general business of the country, to the merchants, manufacturers, and farmers who have to work without the special services of the Federal Government in their behalf? Their lot seems to be to bear in taxation a share of the expense of a policy which benefits only a privileged few, a policy which netted a loss in trade of \$57,200,000 to the Nation, or 14 per cent of our total exports to eight of our sister Latin-American Republics in the calendar year just closed. These are serious figures. When an export trade shrinks at the rate of 14 per cent a year, something is radically wrong with the policy which controls it. It is time to face the question in all candor. Are we not "killing the goose that lays the golden egg" in Latin America?

The moral issue can not be evaded. An unconscious boycott of American goods, based on growing enmity, is obviously beginning to operate in Latin America. And every day that our present hypocritical Latin America policy goes on, we are losing prestige in the field of international relations; every day we are gaining the increased enmity of all the American Continent outside our own borders.

The time may come when we shall need friends in the western continent and elsewhere in the world. Before we discovered "dollar diplomacy" we had grown from a wilderness and a strip of seaboard to be the greatest and most respected Nation in the world; we traded with all countries; our flag was welcomed wherever it went; and our trade followed the flag, because it was universally understood that behind our policy lay "a high moral principle of ethics and government." But to-day in Latin America we are rapidly dissipating the proud heritage of our traditions and history.

I said that both the spirit and the letter of the Monroe doctrine were dead. No European power is likely ever again to attempt to colonize the American Continent. If such a move were made, it would immediately call forth the armed opposition of the United States, regardless of the Monroe doctrine or any other policy. Thus to keep the bare name of the Monroe doctrine alive, when its only excuse is as a cover for ulterior acts and motives, is a constant source of irritation on the American Continent. The most statesmanlike policy which the United States could pursue in Latin America to-day would be officially to revive in all their force and integrity, in terms of present-day conditions, the ideals which the Monroe doctrine originally espoused.

## A NEGRO'S VIEWS OF SENATOR BLEASE

**Mr. BLEASE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to myself appearing in the Pittsburgh Courier, of Pittsburgh, Pa., on December 24 last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

## A DANGEROUS MAN

Senator COLE BLEASE, Democrat (of course), of South Carolina, is a dangerous man. He is a menace both to the Nation and to the Negro race. Rising from the depths of illiterate South Carolina, he has for years disgraced and sullied the National Capitol by his presence and by his ignorant, insane, anti-Negro propaganda. He loses no opportunity to spew his venom upon the Negro nor does he ever hesitate to fan the flames of race prejudice on every occasion. When the Aiken massacre shocked the intelligent people of his State and of the Nation, and when humanitarians in every part of the country were denouncing the foul crime, it was the unspeakable BLEASE who aligned himself with the forces of lynchocracy and offered them his services. Supposed to be representing the 900,000 negroes of his backward State, he never misses an opportunity to insult them and their brethren in every part of the country. Supposed to be representing the 900,000 white people of South Carolina, he has aligned himself with the forces of reaction in opposing the passage of child labor laws that would emancipate little children from machine slavery in the cotton mills. Sworn to uphold the Federal Constitution, he not only connives in but advocates its violation. Wedded to the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, he strives for the violation of the manhood rights guaranteed by the preceding ones.

Now he runs true to form by seeking to put a further premium upon bastardy, adultery, fornication, and concubinage in this country. To this end he has introduced a bill in the United States Senate which would prohibit the intermarriage of negroes and Caucasians anywhere in the United States as it is prohibited in his own benighted State of South Carolina. This bill would render any such marriages, of no matter what duration, null and void and would subject the parties to them to imprisonment, along with the officiating clergymen or magistrates. When it is considered that already 29 States in the United States have enacted similar legislation, the possibility of such a pernicious law is by no means as remote as some might think. Another bill he has introduced in the Senate would require separate accommodations for white and black passengers on the street cars in the District of Columbia, where already segregation and discrimination because of color stalks triumphant.

The two hateful bills have been referred to committees where it is probable that they may be buried, but with this man continually urging their passage there is no way to be sure that at some future time they may not actually come up for passage. Like many of his southern white brethren—and many in the North—BLEASE is an indefatigable propagandist for crackerism in all its hated forms. He fails to recognize or ignores the fact that the Negro is a citizen, and the Federal Constitution means little or nothing to him. In his bitter hatred of the Negro he will go to any lengths to insult, hamper, and humiliate him. A power in the principal legislative body of the Nation, he is using his position at every opportunity to undermine the foundations of good government. More than any other Member of the Senate, he is a danger and a menace, and all those who sincerely strive for the better race relations will breathe easier when he is finally returned to the obscurity from which he ought never to have emerged.

## INVESTIGATION OF NAVAL OIL RESERVE LEASES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 101) submitted by Mr. NORRIS on January 4, 1928, was read, as follows:

Whereas in the Sixty-seventh Congress the Senate passed Senate Resolutions 282 and 294, which resolutions directed the Committee on Public Lands to investigate the entire subject of the leases upon naval oil reserves with particular reference to the protection of the rights and equities of the Government of the United States and the preservation of its natural resources; and

Whereas said committee never completed said investigation, the same having been suspended because of the refusal of one Harry F. Sinclair to answer the questions of the committee, and said committee has never made any final report to the Senate; and

Whereas in the case of the United States against Harry F. Sinclair and Albert B. Fall it was disclosed upon the trial that a fraudulent corporation, known as the Continental Trading Co. of Canada, had been organized for the purpose of using the profits of its business in the bribing of public officials of the United States and for other dishonest, dishonorable, and illegal purposes; and

Whereas it was disclosed upon said trial that profits of said corporation were invested in Liberty bonds of the United States and that only a portion of said Liberty bonds so invested had been definitely

traced and accounted for and that a large amount of Liberty bonds coming into the hands of said fraudulent corporation had been unaccounted for and unexplained: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the said Committee on Public Lands be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to renew and to continue the investigation provided for in said Resolutions 282 and 294, and said resolutions are hereby renewed as fully and as completely as though they were herein fully set forth; and be it further

*Resolved*, That said committee is specifically directed to make an investigation as to the transactions and activities of the said fraudulent corporation, the Continental Trading Co. of Canada, and it is specifically directed to trace all the Government bonds held and dealt in by said corporation with the purpose of ascertaining the beneficiary or beneficiaries of all the illegal transactions connected with the fraudulent and dishonest sale or leasing of the said naval oil reserves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair with respect to the resolution which has just been adopted. The parliamentary inquiry is whether under the law that resolution should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I should like to state to the Chair, if he has not followed the reading of the resolution closely, that the original resolution authorizing the investigation did go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and money was authorized to be used for that purpose. The resolution which has just been adopted merely directs the committee to proceed and continue the investigation. Now the question arises whether it is necessary that the resolution extending the jurisdiction of the committee and directing them to proceed further with the investigation should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I myself do not believe that the committee died with the end of the session. I think under the Supreme Court's decision it continues, but in this resolution it is stated that the other resolutions are renewed as fully as though they were set forth in this resolution.

Mr. MOSES. May I suggest to the Senator that in that event further expenditure under the resolution is to be paid out of a new appropriation, a new contingent fund for the Seventieth Congress, and I think, therefore, that the resolution should go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I myself do not believe in being technical about it, but if the resolution should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses it will only mean a delay of a day or two, and rather than have any doubt about it or have the question raised, I ask that the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to may be reconsidered and that the resolution may be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote whereby the resolution was adopted is reconsidered, and without objection the resolution is referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

## HENRY A. BELLOWES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order and will be proceeded with.

The business on the Calendar of General Orders was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) for the relief of Henry A. Bellowes, which proposes to pay him for the period during which he served as a member of the Federal Radio Commission.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution may go over for the reason that we are having hearings tomorrow on the question of the confirmation of the newly nominated members of the Radio Commission, and I think it would be well to have the joint resolution go over until after that hearing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will go over. That completes the call of the Calendar.

## ENFORCEMENT OF PROHIBITION

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two very interesting editorials from the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, one entitled "Lawlessness—and a little Latin" and the other entitled "Demoralizing the elders."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair). Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

## LAWLESSNESS—AND A LITTLE LATIN

The number of inhabitants in South Carolina in Governor Richards's administration is doubtless greater than it has been in any other, and



the number of persons who make, sell, or transport intoxicants is certainly as great proportionately as it ever has been. Probably it is greater. That is sufficient to prove that the Richards administration is the most lawless that the State has had. It has more lawbreakers.

Although the Greenville News is unable to follow this argument of the News and Courier, it says that "in violating some of these laws (doubtless referring to those relating to Sunday observance, prize fighting, and others) last year we were not conscious of having turned criminal. We were enjoying the bliss of ignorance in our wholesale career of crime."

The News says too much, however, when it asserts that these laws were being violated last year and the year before. Of that no evidence is available. The News can't prove the violations. Hence it should not allege them. Governor Richards this year has produced the evidence of the lawlessness, and his administration is entitled to the credit. We bestow it. Having discovered the existence of great numbers of lawbreakers, who were not at large so far as the records disclose, in McLeod's time or Cooper's, the incumbent administration must accept them as its characteristic.

No one could go to court and swear out warrants against golf players and druggists at Aiken and Camden for violations in 1926, and until that is done they are entitled, under the Constitution, to the presumption of innocence—indeed, until they are convicted.

One of our friends, returning from the State fair, reports that he saw more people together than he has ever seen before in South Carolina, and that he saw more "drunks." It is astonishing that anyone drinks whisky in Columbia. How did the stuff get there? Have we not prohibition, both Federal and State, and a State administration holly resolved to enforce it? Yet it seems to persons with long memories that the energies of the State are not so fiercely directed against the violators of prohibition now as they were against the "blind tigers" between 1903 and 1900. Those were the days. The chasing of lawbreakers was incessant, and nothing was left undone to protect the traffic of the dispensers.

"It is difficult to blame all this on the Richards administration," the News observes. Who said anything about "blaming" it? Governor Richards is a fine old fellow, honestly intent on doing good. It would be ridiculous to "blame" any human creature for failing to chew as much as he has bitten off. He has passed 60.

How can the dear old gentleman control the thousands of wild young bucks under 30? His generation has passed, and no one expects him to be aware of what us youngsters are about.

Besides, as the News and Courier has said, our generation is demoralizing most of the elders. The governor is one of the few, the noble few, Pike's Peaks of nineteenth century virtue left standing. We, the wicked and perverse, admire and extol him.

"O tempora! O mores!" Governor Richards made neither the tempora nor the mores. Despite the lawlessness of his administration he is doing much good by precepts and example. He may continue to bite off more than he can chew, and there will be much to amuse, but the Commonwealth of South Carolina will not be disgraced or seriously damaged while Richards is governor. "Clarum et venerabile nomen gentibus."

#### DEMORALIZING THE ELDERS

Without disagreeing with the Bamberg Herald that gambling games at fairs should be forbidden and prevented, these expressions of its editorial article excite our interest: "It is the moral effect on our young people, however, that especially interests us. If our Government authorities permit open gambling at fairs, our boys may well argue to themselves, Why is it wrong to gamble elsewhere?"

What is of more concern, we mildly hint to the Herald, is the "moral effect" on our old people of the behavior of the young.

Does not the Herald suspect that the young people are leading their elders astray?

If all the girls smoke cigarettes, how is "mother" to resist the temptation?

If the young man takes a flask to a dance, will not "daddy" succumb?

If the sophomore, girl or boy, bet \$2 on the Carolina-Citadel game, how are the "old grads" to escape the contagion?

In old times the example of old people contaminated the young, but that was before the young got loose. Should not something be done to rescue the middle-aged and the venerable from the insidious influence of their children and grandchildren?

A generation ago, when the elders were in control, they forbade their young wrongful indulgences because they were wrong, not because there was a law against them. In some way or other these elders absorbed the idea of the wrong of betting from teaching.

One can think of the possibility of teaching young people what is wrong now by appealing to their good sense.

"SENATOR WALSH'S PART"—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun there appeared a very excellent and able article by Mr. Frank R. Kent discussing the part played by the senior

Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in the recent Teapot Dome scandal. I ask that I may have the article inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—SENATOR WALSH'S PART

Though it is true, as the sly Mr. Slomp with a satisfied smile so astutely says in accounting for Republican strength and the futility of Democrat attack, that "prosperity absorbs all criticism," it does seem that to the reflecting few there would come occasionally as they consider certain facts a feeling that this would be a pretty sad sort of country if it were not for the Democrats, regardless of their dissensions, stupidity and shortcomings. To those who think that uncovering corruption in politics and government is a real public service, who consider the moral welfare of a people as important as their material welfare, unless their memories are bad, it must seem that, out of power though it is, the Democratic Party has not been without its uses in the last four years.

It was pointed out here the other day that if it had not been for Senator REED of Missouri, a Democrat, the two most outrageous political scandals that have occurred in a generation—those connected with the election of Mr. VARR in Pennsylvania and Mr. SMITH in Illinois—would have totally escaped national notice, and these gentlemen would in a few days take their Senate seats without so much as a critical or unkind word.

The present ugly—it's a mild word—situation in Washington, where the grand jury is investigating charges of jury tampering in the interests of Mr. Sinclair, who, along with Mr. Fall, has been denounced by the Supreme Court for "fraud, conspiracy, and corruption," ought to call attention to the public service of another Democrat—Senator THOMAS J. WALSH of Montana—even greater than that of Senator REED.

It ought to recall that, if it had not been for Senator WALSH, Mr. Fall and Mr. Doheny and Mr. Fall and Mr. Sinclair would have succeeded in stealing the naval oil reserves of the Nation at Elk Hills and Teapot Dome and would—all three of them—to-day be living among us as honorable and respectable men, utterly free of that indelible Supreme Court brand that marks them. It was Senator WALSH, blocked and thwarted at every turn by the Republican organization and without sympathy or help from the Republican administration, and in the face of a barrage of newspaper criticism that he was "playing politics," seeking publicity, making a mountain out of a molehill, who kept at his job until he brought the amazing facts to light.

When the results of his work are considered it does seem that, even in such a material age as this, something more of national appreciation and gratitude should go to him. The Nation has recovered its great oil reserves. The men who had conspired to take them away have been compelled to pay back to the Government more than \$10,000,000. The Supreme Court in two burning decisions has unanimously upheld the WALSH contentions, and in denouncing the defendants employed words that in the last campaign when used in the Democratic platform and by Democratic spokesmen were called partisan and demagogic.

One criminal case ended in a jury acquittal of Mr. Fall and Mr. Doheny, but in the other jury case it has resulted in a mistrial, due to the espionage established over the jury by a detective agency employed by Sinclair interests. There will be a new trial in January.

Since the Supreme Court decisions and the Sinclair trial a great many newspapers that in the 1924 campaign minimized the whole Fall-Doheny-Sinclair business scoring the Democratic charges as hysteria and political claptrap, have teemed with denunciatory editorials. Some are in a high state of indignation. Some seem to favor burning Mr. Sinclair at the stake. Very few, however, ever mention the name of the quiet, determined, resourceful, able, and modest man whose dogged fight against great odds prevented the complete success of one of the greatest frauds ever attempted against the Government of the United States.

It does seem that it would occur that Senator WALSH has done something worth even now a word of praise; that glorious as it is to be prosperous, magnificent though it may be to reduce taxes when revenues are vastly in excess of expenditures, splendid though it is to preach economy and advocate happiness, the single-handed uncovering of so vast a governmental conspiracy, with such complete vindication of the effort, ought to entitle Senator WALSH to a little more credit than he gets. It ought, in fact, to make him more or less of a national hero. Prosperity seems not only to absorb all criticism but, so far as the public is concerned, about every other mental faculty there is.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Florida wishes to address the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to make some observations on the subject of the American merchant marine, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed with those remarks at this time, although there is now no measure pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Florida proceeding? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, James Freeman Clarke, as I remember, made at one time a statement which very much impressed me. It was to the effect that the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks of the next election and the statesman thinks of the next generation.

We have reached a very critical stage in respect of our merchant marine, and I wish to appeal to the talents and abilities in both this body and the other—and there are in both bodies men so equipped as to be classed as statesmen—to consider this subject from the standpoint of statesmanship, from the standpoint of the next generation.

Our merchant marine has reached a stage where, in all probability, we will lose our position on the high seas in a very few years. Our ships are vanishing now, and it is absolutely necessary that Congress take a positive position with reference to establishing and maintaining an adequate American merchant marine.

We are without much guidance or leadership at present with respect to that great subject. With the utmost respect for the President, and without any purpose of criticizing or finding fault, I feel that it is proper now to analyze briefly his message to Congress delivered at the beginning of this session, on December 8, 1927.

Under the heading of "Merchant marine" the President said:

The United States Government fleet is transporting a large amount of freight and reducing its drain on the Treasury.

That is a condensed statement, very clearly put, and covering a great deal of ground. I fully agree with every word of it.

He further said:

The Shipping Board is constantly under pressure, to which it too often yields, to protect private interests, rather than serve the public welfare.

If I understand the English language, that is a severe indictment of the Shipping Board, somewhat more remarkable in view of the fact that six members of that board have been appointed by the President, and one of them has been reappointed. No doubt the President had before him facts which justified this severe arraignment of the Shipping Board. I should say, however, without being authorized to make any defense of the Shipping Board, that in my judgment this yielding to private interests rather than serving the public has been largely due to the policy insisted upon by the White House.

Undoubtedly the Shipping Board has served private interests without regard to public interests in pursuing a policy directed, it would seem, from the White House to get speedily out of business, and to transfer promptly and without delay the ships owned by the Government into private hands. In pursuance of that policy ships have been sacrificed. They have been practically given away. Private interests have been served, the public interest has been ignored, in following that course, resulting from emphasis being placed on the secondary purpose as expressed in the merchant marine act of 1920, rather than upon the primary purpose as emphasized in that act over and over again. In the very beginning of the act and throughout the act, when powers were given to the Shipping Board to sell the ships, it was provided that always they must keep in view the primary purpose of establishing and maintaining an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean to imply by his remarks that the ships as now operated are not carrying out the purpose of the law and helping to maintain an effective merchant marine?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the present plan of operation is succeeding fairly well. I find no fault with that. It is the policy of getting out of business and getting rid of the ships that has been insisted upon which, in my judgment, has resulted in serving private interests rather than the public interests.

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, the shipping act does provide that at the earliest moment these ships shall be turned over to private operation. Is it not a fact, however, that the ships which the Senator has in mind, having been turned over to private operation, are being operated effectively to maintain for us an American merchant marine?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will show to the Senator before I get through that, notwithstanding these sacrifices, and notwithstanding the pursuit of this policy day in and day out for eight

or nine years, there is to-day less tonnage privately owned under the American flag in foreign commerce than there was in 1914—excluding, I mean, the tankers, which everyone knows are owned by oil companies and other concerns using them in carrying their own products and not engaged in general commerce.

The Senator, however, is in error with reference to the language of the act of 1920. That act does not say that the purpose is to pass these ships into private hands as speedily as possible. It says that the purpose and policy of Congress is to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine to serve our commerce in times of peace and as auxiliaries to the Navy in times of war, ultimately to be passed into private hands. The secondary thing is passing into private hands not the primary thing at all; and the emphasis has been laid by the administration upon the secondary purpose ultimately to pass into private hands. "Ultimately" means finally, not speedily, not at once; but finally the idea of Congress was that these ships might pass into private hands.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has spoken about the decline in the tonnage. Of course the decline of which he speaks has no relationship to the lines which have been sold by the Shipping Board, because those lines are operated effectively in maintaining an adequate American merchant marine. I refer specifically, for instance, to the President ships. They were sold cheaply; they are now in private hands; but they are being operated—effectively operated, as I view it—and so the American merchant marine in toto has not suffered by reason of the sale and disposal of those particular ships to private parties.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand the Senator's proposition. With reference to the President ships, there were seven magnificent passenger and cargo carriers, costing the Government over \$30,000,000, sold for \$4,500,000 payable during a period of five years, with a guaranty only that they would be operated in that service for five years. That time has nearly expired. What will become of the ships after that guaranty terminates no one can tell. They may go into the coastwise trade. They may abandon that service entirely. They have a perfect right to do it. But though they were the finest ships afloat on any ocean, they were sold for something like 10 per cent of their cost, and they were new ships.

I can give other illustrations. It would take me all day to cite these instances, but one I recall particularly:

A German ship was seized by this Government. She was used in the transport service. She cost to build \$1,600,000. After the war the Shipping Board concluded to recondition that ship and make her a passenger ship and put her in the service from Los Angeles to the west coast of South America. They spent \$2,000,000 on the ship. They spent, within a month of her sale, \$43,000 on hotel supplies placed in the ship; and they sold that ship, with the furnishings and hotel supplies and all equipment, for \$100,000. That ship was the *City of Los Angeles*. Is not that a clear illustration of taking care of private interests rather than regarding the public interest?

Other instances of a similar kind can be pointed out; and it seems to me that they must have arisen under the policy dictated by the administration to get out of business and pass these ships into private hands.

Says the President:

More attention should be given to merchant ships as an auxiliary of the Navy.

Precisely; I quite agree with that. That is a most important thing to consider in this connection. If Great Britain had not owned the enormous merchant fleet that she did own at the beginning of the submarine policy on the part of Germany, she would have been out of the war within eight weeks after the submarines began sinking merchant ships on the sea. It was her merchant marine rather than her floating batteries, her navy, her battleships and cruisers, that saved the situation for Great Britain in that time of trouble.

Is not that a lesson for the United States? Can we afford to sink our ships, give them away, and have them pass out of existence? As a great Nation, can we take such a position as that? I say to the Senate now that the question is now, to-day, not whether we shall have private ownership or private operation of a merchant marine, or Government ownership and Government operation, but whether we shall have any merchant marine at all or not. That is the question. So the President is entirely right in emphasizing the importance of merchant ships as auxiliaries of the Navy.



Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I would like to ask the Senator if he has investigated a supposed lobby that is representing a powerful interest on the Pacific coast, that has been exerting a great deal of influence to secure these ships from the Shipping Board for speculative purposes, rather than as a service to the country?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no particular knowledge of that lobby, and I have made no study or investigation respecting it. I will be very glad, indeed, to have the information which the Senator suggests.

I do say this, that to guarantee the operation of a particular service for a period of only five years is practically no guaranty at all. Five years is but an hour in the life of a nation, and that has been heretofore the extent of the guaranties in the sale of these ships, guaranteeing to maintain the service for a period of five years, without any guaranty at all with reference to replacements, without any guaranty that other ships will be substituted for those that may go down or be lost or wear out. In a five-year period a whole line may go to pieces, and of course eventually the ships must disappear. They wear out. There has never been in any contract in any sale any guaranty for replacing the ships.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator has quoted from the President where he urged that our merchant marine be developed along the line of an auxiliary to the Navy. Have not that thought and idea been suggested again and again on the floor of this Chamber? That has been urged again and again, and I now ask the Senator what concrete act or step has been taken by anybody to develop the merchant marine along that line?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that he is quite correct; that is one of the purposes set out in the merchant marine act of 1920. That act provides that in case of reconstruction regard shall be had for placing guns and that sort of thing on ships. That has been the idea running in the minds of Congress throughout all the legislation on this subject, and we have sought to emphasize that, and the merchant marine act does emphasize it. But what sort of auxiliary to the Navy do we have when we are told that we must get out of the business and pass these ships into private hands?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Practically nothing has been done.

Mr. FLETCHER. Nothing has been done.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Just vain words.

Mr. FLETCHER. The suggestion has been made—and I have no doubt that will be attended to—that Congress decide, as I think they ought to decide, definitely, positively, and clearly, that we propose to have an American merchant marine; and the only certain way of having it, the only known way, the only possible way at the present moment is for the Government to construct the ships and operate the ships. That being true, the Government will see to it that in all reconstruction and in all new construction this thought of serving the Navy will be provided for.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will concede, will he not, that in order to accomplish the thing he has in mind it is necessary to change the law? The law, as it is at the present, as I recall to his attention section 5 of the merchant marine act of 1920, states specifically—

That in order to accomplish the declared purposes of this act, and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof—

which is to have an effective merchant marine and prepare for the national defense—

the board is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as practicable, consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale after appraisal and due advertisement—

And so forth.

In other words, the Shipping Board is acting under this act, and the act specifically provides that these ships must be sold as soon as possible.

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not say they must be sold.

Mr. COPELAND. It says "authorized and directed to sell." That is the language.

Mr. FLETCHER. As soon as practicable, and on a business basis; not as a bankrupt concern, not as a concern forced to sell, not as the primary purpose of the act at all, but in pursuance of the expressed purpose to establish and maintain an American merchant marine.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not think there is any difference between the Senator from Florida and myself, but I am convinced that if these ships are to be operated as the Senator suggests it is necessary to change this law, because, as I read the law, the Shipping Board is under obligation to dispose of these lines—is directed to dispose of these lines as soon as possible.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not as soon as possible, but as soon as practicable, only when they can accomplish the primary purpose, the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine. Otherwise, they have no business to sell.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. The merchant marine act of 1920 really does not need any tampering with or amendment or modification, in my judgment. It is plain and clear, if it is interpreted as it should be interpreted. The fault has been a misconstruction of the act, and an interpretation placed upon it which is not authorized or justified. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York to a proviso in section 7 of the act, near the middle of the page:

*Provided further*, That where steamship lines and regular service have been established and are being maintained by ships of the board at the time of the enactment of this act, such lines and service shall be maintained by the board until, in the opinion of the board, the maintenance thereof is unbusinesslike and against the public interests.

My information is that, without regard to that provision of the law, the Shipping Board has sold a number of these services without declaring them unbusinesslike, without declaring that the service was against the public interests. In my judgment, in so acting the Shipping Board has not only misconstrued the law, but it has deliberately violated the law.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is ample foundation for the Senator's thought on that subject, and I quite agree with him, the merchant marine act has not only been misinterpreted and misconstrued, but actually violated in the administration of the act. In doing that, this board, and not merely this present board, but whatever board was in office at the time these transactions took place, has served private interests and ignored the public interests.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I seriously question the statement that the Shipping Board has violated the provision to which attention has been called by the Senator from Tennessee. These services are maintained, and it was specifically provided that when the ships were sold, the service should be maintained. I want to say further that this act contemplates a geographic distribution of the service. I doubt exceedingly if the Senator can point to the sale of any service which violates in any sense whatever the provision which he has read.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to reply—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I recall that there was a hearing in Memphis, Tenn., in reference to shipping matters some years ago, and members of the board who were there were very much surprised to find that there was any such provision as that in the law. Evidently it had not been called to their attention, or they had not noticed it before. To be accurate about the language of an inquiry I made at that time I would have to have it before me, and I have not it before me; but as I recall, I asked when they had declared the operation of certain lines unbusinesslike, or against the public interests. They said that they had not declared the operation of any lines unbusinesslike, or against the public interests. Therefore it seemed to me that in not having first declared, as required by this law, that the lines that were sold were either operated in an unbusinesslike manner or against the public interests, the board was without authority of any kind to sell such lines.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me a moment—I dislike to cut in on him, but it is not quite fair to let the comment of the Senator from Tennessee pass unnoticed. As a matter of fact, whether the Government operates these ships or whether they are operated by private individuals, if it is an unbusinesslike procedure and a useless procedure, why should anybody operate them?

As a matter of fact, whether the board knew it or not at the time of the conference spoken of by the Senator, when these services were sold on the Pacific coast there was no service interrupted, there was no port which was no longer served. Attention was given by the Shipping Board to the needs of that particular district. So, although it is not for me to defend them, and I desire to do it merely as a matter of simple justice, I do not believe the Shipping Board has violated the shipping act in any sense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can easily understand why the Senator takes that view, because evidently he has not yet read the proviso. If the Senator will listen to the proviso again he will see how they violated it. It provides:

That where steamship lines and regular service have been established and are being maintained by ships of the board at the time of the enactment of this act, such lines and service shall be maintained by the board—

Not by private interests—

until, in the opinion of the board, the maintenance thereof is unbusinesslike and against the public interests.

Of course it referred to the operation of the ships of the board. There can not be any question about it.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator take that proviso entirely separate and apart from the context?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all. It was just giving the board the right to sell under certain circumstances and denying it the right to sell under other circumstances.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will bear with me just a moment, if the board could dispose of these ships in such a way that there would be no interference with service, and that no section of the country should be interfered with, and that an effective American merchant marine might be carried out, according to the general purposes of the act, it would seem to me that the board acted very wisely.

Mr. McKELLAR. But at the same time they disregarded the law.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. I would like to ask the Senator from New York if he thinks it is a wise thing for our ships to be turned over to the dictation, practically, of one international banker on the Pacific coast who is trying, through his influence, to obtain a monopoly of the shipping interests of our western coast section?

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator from Florida will allow me to answer, I do not know that the statement made by the Senator from Nevada is the case. It would take more than one session of the Senate to convince the Senate that the statement or the implication is correct.

Mr. ODDIE. I think when the time comes there will be no question of convincing the Senate that this banker I have referred to on the Pacific coast, whose name I will not mention now, is exerting influence in obtaining these ships and that it will result in a practical monopoly if he has his will.

Mr. FLETCHER. A Senator sitting near me suggests that that is probably true of other coasts than the Pacific coast.

Mr. ODDIE. It goes farther than the Pacific coast.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, referring again to the matter under discussion, if a line is being conducted and proves to be unbusinesslike, and is losing money, hopelessly losing money, it does not help the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine, even to sell or give away that line to private parties. That does not help the situation any. The private concern, if it is a losing proposition, is going to break, too, and it is not fair to them to make such a sale.

On the other hand, it was expected all along that some of the lines established by the Shipping Board would at the beginning prove unprofitable. The idea was to extend our trade. The idea was to expand our commerce and open up new markets and develop trade, and the Shipping Board was expected to lose money in the beginning. But it was believed that eventually the public would get the benefit of these enlarged markets and this extension of our trade, and eventually the lines would become profitable.

Then, in my judgment, would be the time to sell, not when the line is nearly bankrupt and losing money every day. What sort of condition is it in to-day? Here is an enterprise of mine, we will say, in which I am losing money by the millions, day after day. Who will come and relieve me by buying this failing enterprise? Of course, that is an absurd

thing to expect to take place, and yet that is the basis on which we have been proceeding. It is not fair. We can not get the price for such an enterprise that we ought to get for it. It is not the time to offer it for sale. The time to offer it for sale is after we have developed the routes and built up the trade and opened up the markets. Then we can say, "This line is a profitable enterprise. If private individuals want to acquire it, we are ready and willing to sell it."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator believe that any American line can be made to pay in competition with foreign ships without some sort of subvention?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it absolutely can be made to pay.

Mr. COPELAND. Has it been done as yet by the Shipping Board?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Shipping Board is now making a profit on the United States lines.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it making a profit if we count interest and depreciation?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; counting all factors entering into it. According to the statement made to me they made \$330,000 last year.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator, I am sure, will not take offense if I say I do not agree with him. I think there are many items left out of those figures. I doubt exceedingly if the United States Line has ever made a profit.

Mr. FLETCHER. I refuse to admit and I have always refused to admit that the American people can not operate ships just as well as any other people anywhere at any time. They have not been encouraged to do it. There has been an enormous amount of money made in shipping in this country by American citizens.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I am sure, while no one wants for a moment to minimize the ability of the American business man in any connection to compete favorably with the business man of any nation in the world, the Senator must admit that our shipowners are to-day compelled to compete with shipowners of other nations of the world on an entirely different financial basis.

Mr. COPELAND. And an impossible basis.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know about that. We have in New York, I think, perhaps the world's financial center. I think centers of trade have moved across the ocean. Centers of finance have moved across the ocean. Why we in this country can not finance the operations as well as the people of any other country on earth I can not comprehend. We can do it, but of course if people hold back and say "We are not going into this business until we are offered a subsidy, we are not going into this business until the Government in some way comes to our support and guarantees us a big profit," there will be some delay about it, because this Congress will not, and I do not believe any future Congress will, be hasty about granting subsidies to the shipping interests.

Mr. EDGE. Speaking of subsidies, the Senator is admitting, as I followed his discussion, that the American merchant marine is, and necessarily will be for some time to come, operated at a loss. Does the Senator believe as a clear business proposition that it is more defensible to pay a deficit, an admitted deficit, a known deficit, through appropriations by Congress, than to pay a businesslike subsidy for service? In either event the taxpayers pay.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is a vast difference. In the case of a subsidy, which we have tried in this country, there are apt to grow up, as there did grow up, tremendous scandals, and that is the situation in the case of subsidies of all varieties in other countries so far as I have been able to learn—favoritism, special interests, various reasons cause scandals to arise, and eventually all benefit intended by the subsidy disappears.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. Is it not true, however, that the English Government subsidizes English vessels and that no scandal or scandalous results have ever followed from that practice?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it is not true. All that England ever did was to loan money at a low rate of interest to shipowners to build ships—

Mr. COPELAND. O Mr. President!



Mr. FLETCHER. And specified that they should be equipped as auxiliaries of the navy, and for that reason they helped build the ships.

Mr. BRUCE. I was under the impression that the English Government also subsidized the operation of the ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. No. No country in the world does it.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. COPELAND. O Mr. President, England does more than is suggested by the Senator from Florida. England not only pays a part of the construction cost of all vessels which are built in conference with the navy but England also pays the salaries of certain of the officers. Also she permits the crew to serve as naval auxiliary members, and then, in addition, she pays very liberal mail subventions.

I want to say further, if the Senator from Florida will permit me, that we have to choose, in my judgment, between the position taken by the Senator from Florida—and if there is no other way to do it I am with him, because I want to see an American merchant marine—between Government ownership and Government operation on the one hand and facing the fact that there must be some sort of subvention paid by the Government. For my part I favor the idea of a postal subvention. The times when we have had prosperity in our Navy can be readily shown by drawing a graphic chart showing the high tonnage when we have paid these postal subventions and when we have given no aid to the American merchant marine, showing how it has become depressed, its tonnage has been reduced, and we have practically been wiped off the seven seas. We must face that situation.

Mr. EDGE. Adverting to the statement I made a moment ago, it is my impression that it certainly was the situation a few years ago, though I have not followed it closely in recent years, that practically every country in the world administering a successful merchant marine has some form of subsidy, call it what we may, but some form of direct government aid.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator will look carefully into the laws of the various countries, he will find himself in error. I have endeavored to trace that matter down, and I have been unable to find any instance of direct government aid. In Germany, for instance, where they operate the railroads they give special rates, perhaps, to some freight which is moved by their ships. As to subventions, we have been pretty liberal ourselves. Our mail contracts are quite liberal, and if it is thought wise to increase the pay for carrying the mail, perhaps I might agree with the Senator on that point. That is not exactly a subsidy, because we do not lose money by that operation. The Government receives quite as much as it pays for the carrying of the mail, as I understand it, and therefore there is no loss, there is not out-of-pocket expense, but it is a help to the ships.

Mr. BRUCE. I will ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that the cost of operating ships in foreign countries is much less than the cost in this country with respect to wages and cost of materials of every sort?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, to be perfectly fair about it, that perhaps it does cost a little more to operate the ships under our flag than the foreign operators are required to meet.

Mr. BRUCE. For information I will ask the Senator how far are ships operated in other countries by the government? In Norway, for instance, do they not operate the ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think Canada is the only Government directly operating its merchant marine.

Mr. BRUCE. May not our inability to run a merchant marine successfully be due to the weaknesses that are inherent in the matter of Government operation itself?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the Shipping Board has not operated in competition with private operators at all. They have avoided it. They have been supplementing rather than competing with the private operation of ships.

But with reference further to the comparative cost of operation, we had numerous hearings extending over months and months of time on that subject. The chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], will recall when we had up the ship subsidy bill. It finally came out, and I think this was the ultimate conclusion reached by the experts, including Mr. Lasker himself, who was then chairman of the Shipping Board, that what is known as the La Follette Seamen's Act really cut no figure so far as our American ownership of ships and operation of them was concerned; that there was, perhaps, a difference in wages and some other expenses because of better conditions on board ship, better food, better accommodations required by our laws than many foreign countries required. But the total difference in cost between operating an American ship and operating a foreign ship, even considering those most economically operated abroad, was about 2 per cent of the cost of operation.

The cost of operation is not the total cost involved when it comes to shipping, but the difference between the total cost of the operation of foreign ships and American ships would be only about 2 per cent as against the American owner. That is a very small item when it comes to an investment of millions of dollars in ships. A difference of 2 per cent in the cost of operation in favor of the foreign shipowner does not eliminate the American from the seas at all. It would not be considered, other things being equal. Besides, we have other advantages; I might point them out, but I shall not now go into a discussion of that question.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Florida also would wish to say this about the La Follette Act: We would not want our American workmen, whether they be on land or on sea, to be treated as serfs, would we?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course not.

Mr. COPELAND. And the humanitarian purpose of the La Follette Act coincides, I am sure, with the wish of the American people. The crews on American ships are treated in a humane way; they have air space, toilet facilities, and a very good quality of food, so that they are treated as decent human beings. So far as I am concerned, if Government ownership were necessary in order to have our crews treated in that way, I should be in favor of Government ownership against everything else, because we would not want to make serfs of our people. However, there are other matters in reference to our merchant marine which have been pointed out by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE] which are more fundamental. I do not think the treatment of crews is the important consideration in the increase in the cost of operation, but there are other matters which I am sure the Senator from Florida will point out in the course of his remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New York is correct with reference to the La Follette Seamen's Act and its operation. It makes it possible to attract the American lad to the seas. Of course, there are foreign countries which employ the cheapest possible labor and give their sailors the most economical accommodations and treat them more or less as serfs. We can not compete with those. I will admit that the American competing with a ship line operated in that way would be operating at a disadvantage, so far as competition is concerned in that instance, but we have got to build up sea power and we can not build up sea power without building up seamen and making it worth while for the American lad again to find his place on the seas.

To do that we must provide means for safety and decent accommodations on board the ships. We can do all that, and at the same time get better results out of the crews, and out of the officers. We get better results in other directions than does the foreigner. One capable, able seaman thus accommodated on board a ship, assured of safety appliances and all that sort of thing, and decent living accommodations, is worth a dozen Lascars or other people whom I might mention. So there are equalizing conditions.

Pursuing the subject further, the President said:

The possibility of including their masters and crews in the Naval Reserve with some reasonable compensation should be thoroughly explored as a method of encouraging private operation of shipping.

I am not in disagreement with that; that is along the line suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If we could work that out, we might accomplish something in that connection.

Public operation—

Says the President—

is not a success.

With reference to that, I wish to say that we never really have had bona fide, genuine Government operation in the United States. The operation has been conducted through contracts with private operators of those ships. One of those contracts, known as the M. O. 4 contract, was, as came out in our investigation and as was admitted on all sides, a most infamous contract. It is utterly incredible that intelligent men would enter into such a contract, for under it the Government bore all the losses of the operation, and the greater the losses the more profit the operator made. The idea of operating through private operators was that there might be developed purchasers for the ships; that such operators would build up the trade, increase the commerce, open up new markets, and that after awhile they would be in position to buy the line. That was one idea—the main idea, I think—of continuing the operation through private operators; that we would thereby develop buyers for the ships. However, what interest is it to an operator ever to put himself in condition to own the line when he can make

more money as an operator under Government contract, under the terms of which the more money the Government lost the more money he made. Of course, that contract has been changed and modified in many respects, and it is a much better contract now. There ought to be contracts made with private operators whereby they would share in the losses and which would make it to their interest to have the lines succeed. That, however, has not been done. Could one ever expect any business to make a pronounced success when it was being conducted in that kind of way?

Of all the shipping services under the Shipping Board the only line which is operated by the Government is the United States Lines, consisting of seven passenger ships and conducting a trans-Atlantic service from New York. It is a most important and essential line for this country. There is some cargo space in those passenger ships.

It is important also that that line should be strengthened and built up. There ought to be two good 20-knot ships added to the *Leviathan*. A proposition has been made, and is being considered by the Shipping Board, to recondition the *Agamemnon* and the *Mount Vernon* and put them alongside the *Leviathan* in that service. That would make a magnificent fleet, and the earnings of the United States Lines would be increased by over a million dollars a year if we add to it the *Mount Vernon* and the *Agamemnon*.

Mr. COPELAND. And they would be net earnings?

Mr. FLETCHER. They would be net earnings. That can be done at the expense of some \$12,000,000. The Shipping Board recommend it, and the Budget Director, after a very thorough examination and consideration of the subject, agreed to it and reported in favor of it, but the President struck it out. So the Budget comes to Congress with that provision stricken out. I can not understand why, for if those two ships shall be added to the United States Lines that line will become one of the strongest in the world. It will earn a net profit in season and out of season to an enormous extent, and away will go the claim that we are losing money operating the ships, and, therefore, we must get out of the business and pass these ships to private hands.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I am sure the Senator will wish to add this fact, that if those two ships were added to the United States Lines we could then carry the great bulk of our trans-Atlantic mail, which we do not do now.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely.

Mr. COPELAND. We are paying to-day to British ships a million and a half dollars for carrying our mails because we have no effective service to do the carrying.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. So if the two ships were added, as the Senator suggests, we could then have the additional revenue for our ships instead of paying it to British ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; the Senator is entirely correct. The schedules could then be so arranged that we could carry the mails in our own ships and receive that benefit.

But, of course, the President does not say that public operation is a failure; he does say that it is not a success. Mr. President, how could we ever expect any business to be a success when we are declaring from the housetops day after day that the business is losing money faster than we want to insure the loss; and when we are saying that, in spite of everything, we are going to quit this business and get out of it? What shipper is willing to make contracts, what shipper is able to make long-term contracts with a shipping line that tells him "To-morrow we may be out of business"? We can not expect a business to be successfully conducted on any such basis as that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. In connection with what the Senator has said I wish to make this suggestion: I had the pleasure of visiting South American ports two or three years ago and I was told by Americans that one of the most effective arguments used against the building up of an American merchant marine was this, that when a merchant contemplated turning the carrying of his goods over to an American line shipping competitors came to him and said, "You had better not do this; you know in the past the Americans have not maintained a merchant marine; we have been giving you good service all the time and now if you turn your business over to the American line the chances are that it will not be running in a few years and then you will have to come back to us"; and they practically intimated what they might expect if that condition came about. Now, apparently we are doing nothing to controvert any

argument of that kind, and our action in the past and our failure to make any provision for replacement of these ships for the future does not make it very difficult for our foreign competitors to convince shippers that under the present conditions they had better not transfer their business.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a natural condition; there is no question about that, and it interferes with our success.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Is not that very inconstancy of policy one of the inseparable concomitants of Government ownership? Inconstancy, incertitude of policy, fluctuations in appropriations from time to time, the existence of conditions which make it impossible to calculate proper adjustments of means to ends are but the ordinary shortcomings and limitations of Government ownership. The managers of private business know exactly what they can count on from year to year, what their revenues are, what their assets are, what the demands for expenditures are, and they frame their policy, and their policy is not subject to congressional vicissitudes of any kind or legislative caprice or whim. That is one of the very reasons why private operation is always incomparably more successful so far as pecuniary results are concerned than is Government ownership and operation. The Government is attempting to grow orchids in maintaining these shipping lines; it is in a business for which it is unfit, just as it has proved itself to be unfit for every form of industrial enterprise. That is the way it strikes me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I see the Senator's point. That has been urged, and there is a good deal in it. I would a great deal rather see private enterprise take hold of the shipping in a business way, run and replace and reconstruct and rebuild, and go on with this business as it should be done in this country. We ought to have some 8,000,000 tons of merchant ships to carry about 60 per cent of our overseas trade; but they will not do it.

Mr. BRUCE. I shrink from subsidies. I, of course, am too good a Democrat not to do that to begin with. I shrink from subsidies; and yet, at the same time, in view of the indispensability of a merchant marine in time of war, I may say, or merchant vessels that can be converted into war vessels, I think I am prepared to vote reasonable subsidies for the maintenance of these lines, provided they are turned over by the Government to private enterprise.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest to the Senator that that will not solve the problem; but, with further reference to his observations about the Government being in position to operate ships, what about our Navy? What about our Army? What about our Post Office Department? The same sort of argument would apply to those.

Mr. BRUCE. When you come to the Post Office Department you have to think of other things besides pecuniary profit. There are all sorts of most peremptory reasons why the mails of the country should not be turned over to private handling; but I recall the fact that Mr. Burleson, the former Postmaster General, testified before a congressional committee that if the rural-mail delivery of this country were turned over to private contractors there would be a saving to the Government of no less than \$18,000,000 a year.

Mr. FLETCHER. But, again, the Government is successfully operating the Panama Steamship Line and has been ever since it took over the line. It lowered rates to all South and Central American ports from ports of the United States. It has been a success, although it carries all supplies for the use of the Government on the Canal Zone at less than commercial rates. It is a profitable enterprise.

Mr. BRUCE. I was reading something on that subject the other day, and the writer—I know not how correctly—reached just exactly the opposite conclusion from that which the Senator reached. He said that notwithstanding the enormous tonnage of freight which passes through the Panama Canal, it has been running at a loss—that is to say, when interest is calculated on the cost of the original investment and due allowance made for depreciation, and due allowance made for all the other things that private enterprise has to make allowance for unless it is prepared to pass into bankruptcy.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Maryland has reference to the Panama Canal. I was not talking about the Panama Canal at all. I was talking about the Panama Steamship Line.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not catch that.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a different proposition.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; it is.



Mr. FLETCHER. But in addition to the Panama Steamship Line, the Government is successfully operating the Black Warrior-Mississippi Line. Canada considers her merchant marine one of her chief assets and is making a complete success of its operation.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I desire to speak by the book now with reference to the bounties paid by Great Britain.

Great Britain pays about a million dollars a year to merchant seamen enlisted in her naval reserve. She pays about \$300,000 in the form of annual retainers to seamen who drill one week every year with the navy. Great Britain pays about \$100,000 a year to seamen who are known as Royal Naval Volunteers; but this is not all. She pays naval subventions to something like 20 fast steamers so built as to be readily converted into auxiliary naval cruisers. These subventions amount to about half a million dollars every year. Nor is this all. The Cunard Line receives an annual subvention of three-quarters of a million dollars in return for the obligation which I have already mentioned, of selling or of leasing any vessel of the line to the Government in case of need. Besides all this, the British Government pays liberally for the carriage of the mails. In the case of France, according to the last report I have France paid in construction bounties \$3,441,000 in one year and in operating bounties \$466,000; and Italy rivals France in the extent to which government aid is given. In other words, outside of the United States there is no maritime power operating a merchant marine without very liberal governmental subvention of some sort.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the United States pays liberally for the carrying of the mails. That is one thing. The United States has exempted from taxation all material entering into the construction of ships or the furnishing of ships. It comes in free of duty. We have provided in our legislation various means of encouraging capital. Then we have also provided a fund which we loan at 4 per cent interest for the building of ships. That is taken care of in our legislation. So that we are not so far behind in these indirect benefits and encouragements to shipping.

Germany came out of the war with about 500,000 tons of ships. She now has nearly 2,000,000 tons. She had over 6,000,000 tons at the beginning of the war, and she is building ships day after day. All these maritime nations are building ships. Great Britain built something over 3,000,000 tons—and I will refer to that a little later—last year; and there were less than 300,000 tons built in the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. Not a ton for the transoceanic trade.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; not a ton for overseas trade.

Then the President said—and I must hurry on, because I am taking up too much time, and I want to get through with this:

No investigation, of which I have caused several to be made, has failed to report that it could not succeed or to recommend speedy transfer to private ownership.

I may say in that connection, that generally speaking, throughout the country, I think, a majority of the people of the United States would rather see these ships in private hands and privately operated; but after eight or nine years of delay and effort to get rid of the ships we have offered them at \$5 a ton, where they cost over \$200 a ton; we have advertised everywhere and by every means that "price makes no difference; come and take the ships," and they are not taking them. Private enterprise stays out. American money is invested in foreign-flag shipping and is making money. The interest of the foreign shipowners is against an American merchant marine, and especially against the Government's owning and operating a merchant marine, because they know they can not run the Government's ships off the seas.

There are difficulties in connection with Government ownership and operation. I concede that; but we are face to face with the proposition, Shall we have any merchant marine or shall we abandon the seas? That is the whole question; and the only certain way that we now know of for having any kind of a merchant marine carrying even 30 per cent of foreign trade is for the Government to own and operate and for the Government to construct and replace and balance the fleet.

Our exporters and importers—

Says the President—

are both indifferent about using American ships.

No wonder, if that be true—and I am not disposed to question it—I would qualify it, because I think in many instances they are anxious to patronize American ships—but how can

they count upon the service when they are told every day that next month this ship may be sold to somebody else and pass into other hands and the service be abandoned?

It should be our policy to keep our present vessels in repair and dispose of them as rapidly as possible rather than undertake any new construction.

I suppose that is the reason why the President struck out this provision for \$12,000,000, recommended by the Shipping Board and passed by the Budget, for reconditioning the *Mount Vernon* and the *Agamemnon*.

Their operation is a burden on the National Treasury, for which we are not receiving sufficient benefits.

I seriously question that proposition. I think there are losses which will have to be met out of the National Treasury and that may continue for some time, but I feel absolutely convinced that the benefits to the American people far exceed these losses; and why talk about losses to the Government out of the Treasury if the people are benefited?

Why, Mr. President, speedily get rid of the ships? We might just as well abolish entirely the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. We might save ourselves the hundreds of thousands of dollars that we appropriate annually to establish new offices and new agencies and endeavor to extend our foreign trade. We might just as well abandon all that effort—and I have been a strong supporter of proper appropriations to maintain the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—if we abandon Government ownership and operation of the ships.

What is the use of building up trade, what is the use of making an effort to find new markets, if you must depend upon your competitors to carry your goods to those markets?

For instance, just as an illustration, here is Russia—a country very rich in natural resources. They have an abundance of raw material, but Russia is not manufacturing much now. On account of communism, lack of machinery and facilities, lack of skilled labor, and all that sort of thing, she is not increasing her manufacturing power. The American people are increasing their industrial strength, and encouraging manufacturing. What chance have our manufacturers to get our goods into Russia in exchange for her raw materials if we are to depend upon Germany to carry our products over there?

There is Germany, a great manufacturing country, right next to Russia. Germany has the ships. If the United States has not any, what possible chance has the American manufacturer to get rid of any of his surplus in that country?

That is one illustration, but it applies all over the world. The Senator from Washington spoke about the information he obtained in South America. I was once down there as a member of the joint international high commission, which was holding a session in Buenos Aires. I was told this story, which I have no reason to doubt: Brazil wanted an enormous quantity of cement for building walls, roads, and other structures, and she advertised for bids. Certain tests had to be submitted to, and the bids came in. The American manufacturers of cement stood the highest tests. The price of the American cement f. o. b. here was the lowest, and America was about to walk away with the contract for millions of tons of cement when Brazil said, "What will you deliver it for in Rio?" Then the manufacturers here began to look around, and they found that there was not an American merchant vessel plying between any port of the United States and Brazil. They had to look to the Lamport and Holt line, a British line, and when they applied to them for rates on that cement, they found the rates so high that Belgium and Great Britain got the contract for the cement and the American manufacturers were cut out.

That can happen with steel rails, with agricultural implements, with everything that we have to go to foreign markets to sell. We have an enormous surplus in this country of farm products, and a surplus of manufactured products. Are we going to say that we will rely upon foreign countries to deliver those products to the markets abroad? Are we to be abjectly dependent upon foreign countries to carry our goods to the waiting markets overseas? If we are, we are helpless, and we will find it impossible to maintain living conditions in the United States, and we will find it not worth while to consider expanding or extending our foreign markets.

A correspondent of mine has submitted some questions to me. I have not the liberty to use his name, but the questions are quite pertinent in this connection.

If Congress should attempt to abandon Government ownership of vessels in foreign trade at this time, what position would it leave the country in?

Would it result in private interests coming forward to take over the Government lines now engaged in foreign trade? Or would it mean

just the complete abandonment of existing Government ownership lines, or most of them?

Private interests are not now disposed, or even able, to take over Government-owned lines. What, in such case, would become of them?

Is the taking over of Government lines now a thoroughgoing success?

Or are those who have taken over the ships, at nominal prices for the ships, able to say that with Government ownership abandoned they would be better able to maintain the lines, build new tonnage as required, and bring the lines measurably up to a parity with the foreign lines with which they compete?

Would immediate abandonment of Government-owned lines cause foreign lines to be more considerate of existing lines of American ships in foreign trade? Or would it, on the contrary, cause foreign lines to focus upon the few American privately owned lines and drive them from the seas? And that accomplished, would not American importers and exporters find themselves called upon to pay ocean freight rates so much higher than now are charged as to make the losses of the Shipping Board trivial, in comparison with the greater cost of ocean transportation almost wholly in foreign ships?

Would the inevitable increase in ocean freight rates that would follow Government abandonment of shipping lines have a tendency to increase or decrease our foreign trade, now in such a healthy state of growth? In other words, has not the gratifying growth of our foreign commerce of recent years been due in large degree to the low freight rates that have prevailed, owing to the presence of so many American ships in foreign carrying?

Are any of the existing privately owned American lines engaged in foreign trade now in a position to build more efficient and swifter ships to supplant the comparatively inefficient slower ships now being operated?

What chance is there of new construction except by the Government?

How much would the chance of new construction be increased by abandonment by our Government of its shipping lines?

Would such new construction as might be undertaken, if at all, inure to the benefit of American shipbuilders, if dependent upon privately owned lines? Or would the new ships be built in foreign countries at greatly reduced cost?

Would the United States, if it engaged in new construction, replacement of semioobsolete, inefficient, slow ships, have them built abroad or at home?

In short, would not immediate abandonment of Government ownership of ship lines in foreign trade cause a rapid lapse back into the condition American ships in foreign trade were in at the outbreak of the World War? Would it not mean the destruction of American shipping in foreign trade, instead of its reconstruction now so greatly needed, and sure to be more than ever needed as time goes on?

Opponents of Government ownership all say, "Get rid of the ships." How can they be got rid of? Who will buy them? If bought, can they be maintained in foreign trade at present or in the near future with private provision for replacement as needed?

If not replaced, how long can existing lines of ships continue?

If replaced with more modern, swifter ships, who will replace them?

Who has suffered because of the Government-owned lines? Not the American people, who never enjoyed so long a period of low freight rates as they have enjoyed since the Government began operating ships in foreign trade. The Government? Is a great saving to the people a loss to the Government?

Are foreign ships suffering because of our Government-owned lines? If ocean freight rates are unremunerative, as we are told they are, and foreign ships carry two-thirds of our foreign trade, as now they do, do they not lose two dollars for every dollar lost by the Government-owned lines? And do not the people enjoy the advantage of the low freight rates?

What shipowners would rejoice more or benefit more than foreign shipowners through the immediate abandonment of Government-owned lines?

There is but one answer to that question.

If Americans who advocate the abandonment of Government ownership of ship lines in foreign trade until private American ownership of the lines is assured are not serving the ends of foreign ship lines, whose ends are they serving?

The Shipping Board is now losing through the spigot and American importers and exporters are saving at the bung. But the abandonment of Government-owned lines would cause the importers and exporters to lose through the bung, while the Government would save through the spigot. Whom would that benefit?

Besides desiring an American merchant marine privately owned, the people desire a real American merchant marine. Would they get it more surely under present conditions from private than from Government ownership?

Do the reports of the Shipping Board indicate that its lines in foreign trade could better succeed under private ownership, bearing the board's losses, than they now do, the Government bearing the losses? That is to say, does not the present operation of American ships in foreign trade prove conclusively that they can succeed only through Government ownership for some time longer?

Should not the Government make the lines more secure, more entrenched in foreign carrying, with shippers having greater dependence upon their permanency and more ready to employ them by continuing them until, beyond a peradventure, they could be maintained permanently, than to risk utter loss by selling or "getting rid" of them now?

Is not Government ownership a bulwark against the loss of lines of American ships? Would not the danger of the loss of the existing American lines be infinitely greater at present under private than under Government ownership? Why take such a risk? Who would benefit by the risk being taken? The people? Private American shipowners? The importers and exporters? No; the competing foreign ships.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The President speaks of the burden upon the Treasury of \$12,000,000 a year for maintenance of our merchant marine. Is not that sum saved manyfold over, perhaps a hundredfold over, to the shippers of America?

Mr. FLETCHER. Unquestionably. In 1924 more than that was saved to the wheat growers of this country when the Shipping Board pulled out of the reserve fleet 105 ships and put them into the carrying of wheat to Europe. It was saved again to the cotton growers of the South in 1926, when the Shipping Board pulled out of its reserve fleet 95 ships and put them into the service, because the British ships, upon which we had been depending, were engaged in carrying coal from Norfolk to England on account of the coal strike in England.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him again, in this connection I recall very distinctly that in the fall of 1926 we had almost an embargo on cotton because we could not get ships. The Senator knows we had a tremendous crop that year, and it was necessary for us to have ships to transport the cotton to Europe. It was for what it did at that time that I want to commend the Shipping Board for the splendid way in which they came forward and furnished the ships so that cotton could go abroad during the fall of 1926.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is entirely correct, and I feel like joining him in that commendation. They are in position to serve the American people as no private enterprise could ever serve them, because no private enterprise will ever have a reserve fleet tied up idle.

The Shipping Board has, and as our trade needs it, and as our farmers need it, and as our manufacturers need it, as any of our people who have a surplus to go abroad need it, they can call upon that reserve fleet for service and save themselves.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that prior to the Civil War American genius produced a merchant marine which carried from 83 to 87 per cent, and some historians say 93 per cent, of our foreign commerce. Does not the Senator think that if we should repeal some of the archaic laws that are upon the statute books; if we would permit Americans to buy ships in foreign countries and place them under American registry; if we would permit American shipowners to have their ships repaired in foreign ports without being penalized for so doing; if we would permit American shipbuilders to bring into the United States materials necessary for the construction of ships without the payment of extortionate tariff rates, an American marine would soon be established sufficient to care for our foreign commerce?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think many of the things the Senator mentions we have now. For instance, we admit free of duty all materials entering into the construction and even the furnishing of ships.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator is in error there, if he will pardon me.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is my recollection of the law. I agree with the Senator that it was a mistake to require that when repairs are made on our ships in foreign yards, 50 per cent of the cost of the repairs shall be added as a penalty. I think that is a mistake. I would like to see that law repealed.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator that I have a bill pending touching that subject, and I hope he will see that it is reported out of the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will be very glad to give attention to it. The Senator has spoken of our shipping in earlier days. I have a chart before me which shows that in 1830 vessels flying the American flag were carrying 89.9 per cent of our overseas trade, in 1840 they were carrying 82.9 per cent, in 1850 they were carrying 72.5 per cent, in 1860 they were carrying 68.5 per cent. Then came the Civil War, then the building of ships out of steel, and new kinds of carriers and various causes



resulted in a decline, so that in 1870 we carried only 35.6 per cent of our commerce overseas in American vessels. In 1880 we carried 17.4 per cent, in 1890 we carried 12.9 per cent, in 1900 we carried 9.3 per cent, and in 1910 we carried 8.7 per cent. In 1920, after spending \$3,000,000,000 to build these ships, we carried 42.7 per cent of our foreign commerce in American bottoms. In 1924 we carried 36.3 per cent. Mind you, we begin this policy of getting out of business and getting the ships into private hands, and this is the result: In 1924 we carried 36.3 per cent, in 1925 we carried 34.1 per cent, and in 1926 we carried 32.2 per cent. Probably in 1930, unless Congress takes some positive stand in this connection, we will be getting back to where we were in 1910.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree with me that if we will repeal some of the restrictive measures now on the statute books, we will go a long way toward the rehabilitation of our merchant marine. The Senator knows that our coastwise trade is in the hands of Americans, who have a complete monopoly, and their boats carry millions of tons of freight annually. If we will adopt rational measures with respect to vessels that are engaged in foreign trade and permit such vessels to engage in coastwise trade, we will build up our merchant marine without subsidies or pursuing the policy which is so eloquently advocated by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

It is the opinion of those best acquainted with the handling of our Government-owned ships that inefficiency and extravagance have been largely responsible for the losses which have resulted. Certainly the policies pursued can not be commended by any business organization. If we placed the ships owned by the Government in the hands of competent men, undoubtedly the results would be far better.

I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that some of our ships are obsolescent and of types that will soon make them obsolete. They were built under high pressure during the war, and to meet a situation entirely different from that now obtaining. As we have made progress in aerial navigation, we have made progress in shipbuilding. Shippers are demanding faster and better ships, in order that their commodities may quickly reach their destined markets. Germany is building ships which are faster than most of ours, and this will result in their capturing markets in South America and elsewhere which the United States should dominate. England is constructing better ships for commercial purposes and our war-built vessels will not be able to compete with them. Diesel engines and other improved machinery are being employed in German boats, as well as those built in other countries. If we would compete with the ocean carriers of other nations, we must change our present policy. That America can operate at a profit vessels to engage in foreign commerce, and can successfully compete with the other countries, I have no doubt. But we must abandon the present policy and adopt a rational one.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am much obliged to the Senator for his interruption. Every maritime nation in the world is building merchant ships just as fast as they can lay the keels, except the United States.

As the Senator suggests, we have got to improve our ships. We have to build faster ships; we have to construct them upon the latest improved lines. But what private American citizen is going to do it? Where are the individuals or the concerns that are going to do it? There is but one way to do it, and that is for the Government to do it.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. May I ask the Senator from Florida why it is that private individuals will not go into this business? Our people are very avid for gain. They never lose a point when it comes to providing the efforts of a business enterprise in one direction or another. Why is it that private enterprise in this country will not take the form of building and operating ships as it once did, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has pointed out?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think one reason is that we have been talking about doing something for private shipowners. At every session of Congress there is some suggestion that we are going to subsidize the undertaking and there is hope of a subsidy. That is one thing that holds them up. To my mind there is perhaps another reason more controlling. For instance, if the Senator and I should form a corporation and make up our minds that we were going to establish a line between Baltimore and Rio and we would go to the Shipping Board and make them a proposition for ships, we could get them for a song. We could start our line. But before investing much money in that line we would want to consider what the prospects are of a

foreign ship line running us off the seas by the reduction of rates in a few months.

Mr. BRUCE. In other words, we would be uncertain as to whether we could successfully compete with foreign lines, and that would be because the cost of operation as respects foreign lines is much lower than the cost of operation of American lines.

Mr. FLETCHER. There might be various other reasons. At one time foreign lines organized what they called "fighting" ships. The purpose of those ships was to lower rates as against independent undertakings, to run those undertakings out of business, and then immediately the rates would go up again.

Mr. BRUCE. If there is any real profit in it the American people would also build and operate fighting lines and fighting ships. Is not the real reason after all that we do not take to the sea because it is not profitable for us to take to the sea and because it is profitable for us to adhere to the land?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is not quite the case. There is a profit in the business. Seven hundred million dollars is the freight bill paid by our people.

Mr. BRUCE. That is a tremendous prize for the spirit of American competition to struggle for. It is worth struggling for but for the fact that there are economic reasons which render it inexpedient for our people to embark on that particular form of enterprise unless some artificial lure is held out to them in the shape of a subsidy or what not that would tend to equalize the disparity between the cost of operating foreign ships and the cost of operating American ships.

Mr. COPELAND. Is there not another thing, that unless the American shipowner is put on the same plane of equality with the foreign shipowner, he can not compete?

Mr. BRUCE. That is to say, put on the same footing of competitive equality?

Mr. COPELAND. Exactly. The cost of building a ship is an item. Suppose he could not get one from the Shipping Board? If he were to go into the American shipyards to-day, he would find that the cost of building a ship here is tremendously greater than it is abroad.

Mr. BRUCE. Precisely. My attention has been called to that fact.

Mr. COPELAND. There is no question about it. For that reason there is now a bill before the Commerce Committee proposing to equalize the difference actually existing and to pay a subsidy of that sort and give that kind of assistance in order that the American shipowner may build and own a ship at the same price that it may be done abroad.

Mr. BRUCE. That is the only thing to be done as I see it. As long as we have the merchant marine that we have now, I am most heartily in favor of keeping it in repair and making whatever necessary replacement the circumstances require. Until we do turn over these ships to private enterprise I think that should be done. I do not think we should begrudge the necessary appropriation for that purpose, and I am free to say I am inclined to question the wisdom of the President in taking the position he did in regard to the appropriation of which the Senator was just speaking. I had the pleasure last spring of going over on one of our boats, the *Leviathan*, and coming back on the *Leviathan*, and as far as I could see a more superbly operated ship never was built. I was highly gratified, indeed my national pride was elated, by what seemed to me to be the splendid management of that ship in every respect.

But I do believe the Government is unfit in the long run, in the long reckoning, for any form of industrial enterprise, whether the operation of ships or otherwise. If we look carefully into the figures, we will find that not one solitary industrial enterprise ever conducted by the Government has been conducted except at a loss. I have repeatedly challenged Senators to state one single, solitary instance in which, over any considerable period of time, the Government ever conducted anything in the nature of an industrial enterprise except at a deficit, and that challenge has never in one instance been successfully met.

I think, so far as carrying on the shipping business or any other business in the nature of business that is ordinarily conducted by individuals, the Government is simply growing orchids. It is not engaged in the raising of potatoes or corn or wheat, but in the growing of orchids. That is what it is doing now in attempting to operate these ships. At the same time I do hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I have listened to his most instructive and admirable address, and I confess some of my presuppositions in regard to the subject have been very considerably shaken by what he has said. I do feel that the situation should be met by the Government. As long as we have the fleet, we should maintain it in the proper way for the purpose of saving the lives of our people,

not to go any further. Then I do hope at some time that our policy will be to look ultimately to the transfer of this great industry to private hands even if we have to pay a price for it, like the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] suggested, in the nature of some kind of a governmental subsidy or subvention.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am much obliged to the Senator for his interruption, but I must hurry on and finish; otherwise I would like to take time to discuss to some extent the points which he has raised. I mentioned three instances a while ago to which I might refer again as evidencing the possibilities of the Government conducting this enterprise. I mentioned the Panama Steamship Line and the Black Warrior-Mississippi Line; also the Canadian Steamship Line operated by the Canadian Government.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I have listened to what the Senator from Maryland stated and I have great sympathy with his feeling in regard to Government operation, and I rather think the Senator from Florida himself has some sympathy with it. I am very much opposed to it as a principle, but I have looked into the possibility of an American merchant marine both from the standpoint of what we have been and from the standpoint of what we are now and ought to be. I am convinced that there is no possibility of an American merchant marine under our present range of cost in production and operation unless we will in some way subsidize to make up the difference, which now seems to be out of the question. It seems to me that we are now facing the alternative whether we will abandon the merchant marine or permit the Government to go ahead with it. From the standpoint of commerce it might be better to let it go, but from the standpoint of national defense it would seem to me an indefensible position to take. For that reason, being very strongly opposed to Government operation, I can not see that there is any other assured way, and I have come to that conclusion very reluctantly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am obliged to the Senator for his remarks. I think he is absolutely sound in his position. I only disagree with him in that I believe that for the sake of our commerce, for the sake of our trade, for the sake of our producers, the farmers and the manufacturers, we must have a merchant marine in overseas trade and, of course, as a means of national defense. We can not escape that position.

Mr. FESS. I think I may have been misunderstood. I meant for the sake of argument to omit the commerce. The commerce feature is an important one.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is very important. It is vital, it seems to me, to the welfare of the country.

I may say now, generally speaking, with reference to an adequate American merchant marine, that there appear to be two distinct policies advanced. First, that favored by the present administration, to the effect that the Government should speedily get out of the shipping business; second, that the Government should continue permanently to own and operate merchant ships in overseas trade.

In the merchant marine act of 1920 the fixed policy of the Government was announced to be to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine. It was declared that the intention was to have this merchant marine "ultimately pass to private hands." It was unfortunate, perhaps, to announce such intention, although it is distinctly a secondary consideration. The prime purpose was to establish and maintain a merchant marine under our flag in foreign commerce adequate to serve our needs in time of peace as well as in times of emergencies.

#### MISTAKEN CONSTRUCTION

The policy announced was all right if properly construed, but those who have had the administration of the act in charge have seemed to largely ignore the prime purpose and lay emphasis upon the second thought. They have appeared to construe the language of the act as meaning the goal to be attained was to get the ships into private hands speedily and get the Government out of the shipping business. In pursuance of this idea those in authority supported primarily plans and schemes for disposing of the ships. They went so far as to sell the *City of Los Angeles* for \$100,000, she being a German-built vessel seized by us during the war, costing approximately \$1,600,000, on which the Shipping Board spent \$2,000,000 to recondition, and also some \$47,000 for hotel supplies within a month of her sale. In pursuance of this policy also the combination cargo and passenger ships—some of the finest afloat on any ocean, having cost the Government over \$30,000,000—were sold to the Dollar Line for \$4,500,000, payable in five years, with the guarantee that they continue the service and fly the American flag during that period of time. A five-year guarantee of service when

sales are made is ridiculous when we consider that time is not more than a minute in the life of a nation. It is not necessary to recite numerous sales at terrible sacrifices in pursuance of this idea of getting rid of ships and getting out of the shipping business. One argument in support of this idea was that the Government was losing some forty to fifty million dollars a year and it was desirable to save this loss.

#### NO EARNEST, SINCERE EFFORT TO SUCCEED

No notice was taken of the fact that no serious, businesslike effort was being put forth to make the business a success, but everything was done to discourage the building up and establishment and maintenance of a merchant marine. Those in authority put themselves in the absurd position of offering the property for sale, which was worse than worthless, according to their claims, inasmuch, as alleged, those who acquired them were bound to lose money. American merchants were admonished of the futility of making contracts for the movement of exports and imports with Government-owned ships because any day, practically without notice, those ships were likely to pass into other hands and under different management and control. No business could succeed on any such basis. Those engaged in it were apparently determined to make it a failure.

#### FAILURE TURNED INTO SUCCESS

Public sentiment reacted to this situation and finally there came a time when more serious attention was given to the problem of operation, with the result that the alleged and exaggerated losses have gradually disappeared and the business is being conducted in a more intelligent, energetic, and efficient manner. It is gratifying to note that the direct operating profit of the United States Lines, embracing five trans-Atlantic passenger ships, for the fiscal year 1927 was \$635,842.97; the loss for the fiscal year 1926, using the same factors, was \$650,000; the net result shows an improvement in 1927 over 1926 of \$1,285,842.97. I am assured that the United States Lines's vessels are in very good condition; that the item of repairs carries several hundreds of thousands of dollars in betterments that could probably be considered as a capital charge. The merchant line of freight ships operated by the Government is also showing a decided improvement, with gratifying results. Those lines, owned by the Government and operated by private operators, are being conducted on a more businesslike basis without very great loss—the losses in no wise approach the saving in freight to our shippers.

#### ATTITUDE OF BUSINESS MEN

I have noted with no little concern the position taken by those who favor the first-mentioned policy, including the resolutions adopted May 4, 1927, by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the comment thereon by newspapers to the general effect that the—

protest is as strong as any protest ever made and has the weight of millions of thinking men behind it.

In supporting this resolution Mr. Gadsden said:

I make no pretensions to any special knowledge of shipping matters.

And further:

As I understand the temper of the business men of this country, we are opposed to Government entering into any phase of business, and we are looking hopefully to the time in the near future when the Government will retire from the shipping business and turn back this great field of American business into the hands of American business.

#### SHIPPING BOARD'S POSITION

During the discussion Chairman O'Connor of the Shipping Board said:

We absolutely want to get out of business, and we are willing to sell to any man, any American, who will come and buy the ships at any time, at any place, and the price does not make much difference. I believe that is a fairly good offer to anybody here who has the idea that the Shipping Board does not want to sell ships. Come down to us; we will sell the ships if you will pick the route out, or we will tell you what the routes are, we will furnish you with the figures as to how the ships are running, how they are running at the present time, whether they are making money or losing money. We will give you all the information, and then you can make up your minds which one of the 23 routes you want to buy and we will sell the ships.

He further said:

We want to get out of business just as soon as we can, and we are trying to do that very thing. I make this statement to you: There is no man that can come to you and state to you publicly, so that it will be heard, that he has tried to buy ships from the Shipping Board and was refused, unless he wanted the Shipping Board to hand them over to him for nothing. That we can not do. They are Government property, and we are going to try to get just as much money for them as we can, especially in individual sales. In route sales, as I said before,



gentlemen, the price does not make the least bit of difference to the Shipping Board. Come and make us an offer, anybody here. We have 23 routes now for sale. Come and make us an offer, if it is \$5 a ton, \$10 a ton, or \$7 a ton. Those vessels cost the good old Government of the United States \$200 a ton. There is a vast difference between a \$5.50 capital investment and a \$200 capital investment. We are giving you a big subsidy to buy the vessels; so if you know anybody who wants to buy, come on and buy. We are ready to sell.

What is the use of talking about getting out of business and delivering the ships into private hands in the face of this offer, which has been repeated over and over again? What is the use of talking about the handicap of American owners when they are offered ships at \$5 a ton that cost \$200 a ton and still refuse to get into the business.

#### CORRECT POLICY

In my judgment, and if I had the authority, I should not say another word about selling ships; I should not insert another advertisement or permit any talk about the Government going out of business. On the contrary, I should announce to the world that private enterprise having failed utterly to take the proper interest in ships and the building up of an American merchant marine, the Government is in the shipping business to stay, and the policy shall be from now on to eliminate the words in the merchant marine act, "ultimately to pass to private hands," and shall be to aggressively carry out the prime purpose of the merchant marine act—to establish and maintain an adequate American merchant marine, and to that end the Government shall continue permanently to own and operate vessels in overseas trade. I should make this issue in the next campaign; I should put this pledge in the Democratic platform and go to the country on it, announcing clearly and unequivocally the policy of this Government to permanently own and operate merchant ships in foreign trade, to serve American commerce, protect American business abroad, and meet our competitors on common ground abroad, and serve our country in time of need.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

Merchant ships are just as necessary in time of war, or when extraordinary conditions arise, as are cruisers, destroyers, and floating batteries. This was demonstrated clearly, so that any man with any sense at all could understand it, during the World War. After the German submarines became active England would have been forced out of the war within eight weeks but for her merchant marine. Our allies had lost 6,000,000 dead-weight tons to December, 1916, and after that they were losing 650,000 tons a month, making their total losses 8,000,000 dead-weight tons for 1917. No wonder the Allies sent forth their urgent appeal to us for ships, ships, and more ships if the war were to be won. Each appeal was warranted by the acute necessity. Mr. Hurley says in his book, *The Bridge to France*:

Germany never would have begun her ruthless submarine warfare on February 1, 1917, if the United States had possessed a substantial merchant marine.

Chairman O'Connor further said during the discussion of this resolution:

It comes rather hard to me to look out of that window and look at the Washington Monument and then sit here in this room and hear a resolution trying to put the American business men in the hole. They will realize that they are going in the hole, gentlemen, the minute you get the ships off the ocean that the Government is operating at the present time.

There is not a shadow of doubt if all the Government-owned ships were given away to private parties within six months they would, in the main, pass into foreign hands or come under the control of foreign interests.

In 1914 not more than 10 per cent of American commerce was being moved in American bottoms. The United States had only 9.4 per cent of the world tonnage. Great Britain had 41.6 per cent. Now we have 21.6 per cent and are carrying about 30 per cent of our foreign commerce. Does the American manufacturer and producer wish to go back to that situation? Does he not remember that when the German ships were out of commission, the British ships commandeered for war uses to a great extent, freight rates went up on wheat from New York to Liverpool from 3 cents to 50 cents a bushel and from \$2.50 to \$50 on cotton per bale from Galveston to Liverpool? Does he not remember when contracts for cement and for steel were offered the United States producers in South America, they were unable to obtain the contracts—not because their products were not superior, not because their prices were not lower, but because foreign competitors were able to control freight rates, and the cost of delivering the goods was made such that foreign competitors could make deliveries at a better figure?

#### SOME ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Chairman O'Connor further said in the discussion of this resolution of protest:

Ask your farmers out in the Middle West, ask your cotton planters in the South what the Shipping Board did for them last fall. Ask them what it did for them in 1924. We saved the day for them. We saved the day last fall for them by putting ships in. Private owners did not have an American ship to carry a cargo of grain out of the southern ports last fall—not an American ship. They did not have any British ships; they did not have any other kinds of ships, because they all left our grain piled in our elevators, they left the grain piled in cars, they left your cotton stored on the docks—for the reason that foreign ships that were carrying that freight could get more money for carrying coal to England.

At the time of the coal strike in England 90 ships were drawn from this Government-owned reserve fleet and put into service by the Shipping Board, and in that way our surplus products of grain, cotton, and the like were able to reach the markets overseas. Private owners were not and could not be in position to render that service. I call attention to further statements by Chairman O'Connor:

Take your locomotive works: How many locomotives did they ever ship to the southern ports from this country direct until the United Shipping Board put vessels on to carry locomotives there? Ask some of them. Ask the Baldwin locomotive people or some of the rest of them how many they shipped and why they did not ship them? Because the American locomotive manufacturer was up against a proposition of a \$4-a-ton transshipment charge before we put our vessels in there. We cut that charge away, and they are now able to compete with the world. The General Electric Co. and the Western Electric Co. are in the same position. There is no transshipment charge on their goods now. They are going right where the people want them in the southern ports, right direct from New York, with weekly sailings.

#### FOREIGN INTERESTS

There is no doubt but that every foreign competitor desires above all things that the Government shall go out of the shipping business and all ships be turned over to private hands. In looking out for the interests of the United States, I am not given to taking the advice of other countries. It is claimed we are violating a great principle by continuing the Government in the shipping business. I deny it. I am perfectly willing that private enterprise should undertake this business; I would greatly desire that—but for 50 years private enterprise has failed, although we did what we could to encourage it. We were in a helpless condition when the war came on in 1914—in an unnecessary, humiliating, indefensible, foolish position of absolute dependency upon foreign ships to move our products to market and bring to us the things we needed. Now, for 10 years past we have spent time and money trying to prove that the Government could not handle this business successfully and trying to persuade private enterprise to get into it. We have been willing to sacrifice the ships, although the people of this country paid some \$4,000,000,000 for this enterprise; the authorities have made every effort to throw that away, and yet with all these inducements private enterprise holds back and refuses to establish and maintain an American merchant marine worth while. We are in very much the same position that we were in during the war when the German submarines became active. Marine insurance companies came to Washington and appealed to the Government to go into the insurance business; they declined to write marine insurance—they said the hazard was too great. Responding to their appeal, the Government established a Bureau of War Risk Insurance and protected shipping during those trying days. The rates were reasonable, nowise exorbitant—in fact, if there was any increase it was very nominal. After the war these insurance companies wanted the Government to get out of the business. All right, it did; showing a profit of some \$17,000,000 made while engaged in it.

#### GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION

It is all nonsense and an unwarranted reflection upon every honest man connected with the Government to claim that men can not be found with sufficient honesty, intelligence, and patriotism to conduct this business. Canada's Government owned and operated ships constitute one of the most valuable assets of that country; Australia has been successfully operating her ships; the Panama Canal Line is a great success, showing satisfactory earnings, notwithstanding they carry all Government supplies at much less than commercial rates. The Government owns and operates the Mississippi & Black Warrior Line, moving a tremendous commerce, keeping down rates, and serving as an additional facility of transportation for great areas of the country. The Government transport lines in the Army and Navy are efficiently and economically conducted. I am thor-

oughly convinced that the one certain way and, so far as we sell, the only possible way for us to have an adequate merchant marine is for the Government to own and operate merchant ships in overseas trade. We must maintain the routes we now have, although the Shipping Board seems willing to practically give them away if private enterprise would keep them up. I would stop this talk, absolutely, about the sale of routes and the sale of ships; I would not even sell the hulls of our so-called obsolete ships for the purpose of being destroyed or scrapped, as per notices in the New York Journal of Commerce of May 16. On the other hand, I would lay them up in fresh water, possibly in the James River, and keep them there without any expense, even for paint, so that they could be drawn upon for use in emergencies—just as supposedly useless hulls were resurrected and pressed into service during the World War.

#### REPLACEMENTS AND RECONSTRUCTION

I do not favor appropriating large amounts of money for the purpose of building new ships in order to replace others that may, in the course of years, be out of commission, if power is to remain in the Shipping Board to sell these new ships at any price they may consider reasonable. I would favor appropriating money to add to the United States Lines such ships as will strengthen and make more profitable that line; I would appropriate money for the purpose of building new ships in order to balance our fleets where needed, but with the understanding and the emphatic declaration that such ships are to be owned and operated permanently by the Government. I would favor a definite program of replacement to supply the facilities our country needs whenever individual Americans fail to provide them.

#### MIDDLE WEST CLAIMS

The Middle West properly demands that steamship routes by way of the Gulf and South Atlantic ports should insure a permanency of service at ocean rates on a parity with the North Atlantic. They justly insist that the ships the United States Government is now operating should be continued in operation.

They are outspoken in the view that in the interest of commerce and national security the Shipping Board should continue to operate through private companies all present lines and services now established and make such additions to lines and services from time to time as may be required.

They very reasonably urge, too, a definite policy of replacement, reconstruction, and modernization of vessels, as our foreign competitors are doing, in order to meet the competition presented by the best of foreign ships. I am in full accord with this position. It is sound and patriotic and vitally important to the whole country.

#### THE SOLUTION

In all candor, having been with this problem since 1909, studied it, read and heard everything put forth on the subject that I could reach, I must say to our Middle West friends and to all others interested—and that embraces all our people—that in order to insure the things you want you must go one step further and insist that the fixed policy of the Government shall be that the Government must own and operate these ships in foreign trade, not interfering with private ownership and operation under our flag, but to adequately supply this country's needs.

The wealth of this Nation is estimated at \$400,000,000,000. We have a foreign trade estimated at \$10,000,000,000 annually. Our freight bill for the transportation of this commerce is estimated at \$600,000,000 annually. What folly it is for the United States to be abjectly dependent upon other countries to carry our goods! Can we expect any fair show in foreign markets, can we ever hope for any expansion of our trade if we must rely upon our competitors to deliver our goods? "Retire from the shipping business"; turn back this great field of "American business into the hands of American business" is fine talk. I can imagine the hearty applause of every foreign shipping interest. If the American business man is not more stupid than I can think of his being, he would raise his voice in protest. He would ask, What then? Who is ready to take over the 24 routes now operated by the Shipping Board or its agents? Who is prepared to operate the 300 ships now engaged by the Government, or any considerable number of them, even if they are given away? What American business men are prepared or ever expect to be prepared to render the service to American commerce evidenced by the figures of the Shipping Board for 1926, when they covered 11,270,341 miles and carried exports and imports valued at approximately \$850,000,000 at a cost to American shippers of 2.2 cents for each dollar's worth of goods carried? Can we afford to have less part in our foreign trade than we are now taking, when—even now—70 per cent of our international trade is carried in foreign-flag ships?

We scrapped 850,000 tons of naval vessels, many of them the most modern types of fighting ships, at a cost of \$400,000,000,

lost our naval position, and now these "business men" want us to scrap our merchant fleets in order not to interfere with private business. We might as well scrap the remainder of our Navy if and when this Government ceases to own and operate merchant ships.

If the Shipping Board goes out of business and the Government ships in foreign trade pass into private hands, within a year thereafter they will be in control of foreign shipping interests. In any case, whether that follows or not, the world routes of trade will be focused in New York and use of the ports of the South Atlantic and Gulf, so far as overseas trade is concerned, will be greatly curtailed, if not abandoned.

Every maritime nation in the world is doing its best to build ships and put them into foreign trade service except the United States.

From 1921 to 1926, for transoceanic service—vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over—

Great Britain built 600 vessels, totaling 3,500,000 gross tons; Germany built 172 vessels, totaling 650,000 gross tons; Italy built 83 vessels, totaling 506,000 gross tons; France built 72 vessels, totaling 450,000 gross tons; Japan built 52 vessels, totaling 250,000 gross tons; and United States built 14 vessels, totaling 137,000 gross tons.

In 1921 the United States had in foreign trade, privately owned, 843 vessels of 2,964,113 gross tons; Shipping Board, 1,716 vessels of 7,656,604 gross tons.

June 30, 1927, the situation was—in foreign trade:

Privately owned, 525 vessels of 2,197,507 gross tons; and Shipping Board, 780 vessels of 4,093,950 gross tons.

In other words, from 1921 to 1927 our shipping in foreign trade has gone from 2,559 vessels of 10,620,717 gross tons to 1,305 vessels of 6,291,457 gross tons. This while we have been supposedly making every effort to create and maintain an adequate American merchant marine and especially to get it into private hands.

Apparently private ownership has increased since 1914, but under the head of "Privately owned" there are tankers, totaling 1,011,000 gross tons, owned and operated by oil companies for the transportation of their own products. Deducting these, it will be noted no progress has been made toward interesting private capital in the enterprise and we can not rely upon that method of establishing and maintaining an adequate American merchant marine.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter from the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce, dated August 11, 1927, which gives the figures respecting our tonnage; also a letter from the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce of October 1, 1927.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The letters are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,  
Washington, August 11, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of the 2d instant requesting a statement showing—

1. American tonnage in overseas foreign trade—

(a) Owned by the Government.

(b) Privately owned.

Divided into—

(a) Passenger ships.

(b) Cargo ships.

(c) Passenger and cargo.

(d) Tankers.

(e) All others, e. g. Tramps.

On June 30, 1927, the total registered (foreign trade) tonnage of the United States included 1,305 vessels of 6,291,457 gross tons, as follows:

Vessel	(a) U. S. Shipping Board 1,000 gross and over		(b) Privately owned			
			1,000 gross and over		500 to 999 gross	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
Passenger.....	13	214,351	95	638,391	3	1,938
Cargo.....	745	3,756,367	261	538,036	9	6,481
Tankers.....	8	48,055	156	1,011,829	1	832
Refrigerators.....	14	75,177				
Total.....	780	4,093,950	512	2,188,256	13	9,251



Under "passenger ships" are included passenger and cargo ships, as they are not stated separately in the records, and I have given the refrigerator ships, as these are separated. I regret that the number and tonnage of tramp vessels can not be given, as they are not shown in the records, but they are included in the totals of "privately owned."

The Panama Railroad Co. has four vessels of 24,445 gross tons documented. It has several other vessels which are not documented and consequently are not of record in this office.

The Mississippi-Warrior service has 11 vessels of 9,788 gross tons, the Inland Waterway Corporation 1 vessel of 1,411 gross tons, and the Engineer Corps 2 vessels of 2,822 gross tons, all of which are documented. The Engineer Corps has many other vessels which are not documented.

You will understand that many of the vessels included in the above figures of registered vessels were laid up on June 30. Of the Shipping Board vessels, only 283 of 1,745,529 gross tons were active on that date.

Respectfully,

A. J. TYLER, Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,  
Washington, October 1, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Complying with your request of August 30 last, I am submitting herewith the following statement showing privately owned vessels (500 gross tons and over) and United States Shipping Board vessels (1,000 gross tons and over) in foreign and domestic trade on June 30, 1921, and June 30, 1927:

	June 30, 1921		June 30, 1927	
	Vessels	Gross tons	Vessels	Gross tons
Foreign trade:				
Private ownership.....	843	2,964,113	525	2,197,507
Shipping Board.....	1,716	7,656,604	780	4,093,950
Total.....	2,559	10,620,717	1,305	6,291,457
Domestic commerce:				
Private ownership.....	1,082	2,266,517	1,432	4,638,848
Shipping Board.....	82	347,167	99	445,756
Total.....	1,164	2,613,684	1,531	5,084,604
Grand total.....	3,723	13,234,401	2,836	11,376,061

Respectfully,

A. J. TYLER, Commissioner.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me from Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, dated December 14, 1927; and also a communication from the Military Order of the World War dated October 26, 1927, all sustaining the position which I have taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The communications referred to are as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,  
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1927.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In a recent letter you asked me to give you the exact wording of resolutions adopted by the National Grange at its recent annual session held in Cleveland, Ohio, November 16-25, regarding the merchant marine and the Federal Farm Loan Board.

Following is resolution with reference to merchant marine:

"Whereas an adequate American merchant marine is vital to our prosperity and security as a nation; and

"Whereas private enterprise, under prevailing conditions, can not fully supply the need in transoceanic service: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Grange favors continued ownership and operation of merchant ships by the Government through the agency of the United States Shipping Board, as necessity demands; and be it further

"Resolved, That we favor appropriations by Congress to keep our merchant fleet modern and efficient."

The grange formally indorsed Worthy Master L. J. Taber's utterance on the question of the Federal farm-loan system, in which he said:

"We do not need a Federal farm-loan system adjusted to suit the desires of the Nation's financial institutions, or its business interests. With such adjustment it would simply be an adjunct to the Federal reserve act. We do need, and must maintain, a Federal farm-loan

system sound in its financial operation, guided and controlled by men competent to handle this huge undertaking, yet who are in sympathy with and understand the problems of rural life."

A resolution adopted by the grange included the following expression of sentiment regarding the farm-loan system:

"Resolved, That we are opposed to any legislation looking to further concentrated control of the farm loan system."

Trusting that this may give you the information desired, I am

Yours very truly,

FRED BRECKMAN,  
Washington Representative.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAPTER,  
MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WAR,  
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1927.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We appreciate the clear presentation of the situation surrounding the United States merchant marine which you pictured to us at the luncheon last week.

I am pleased to advise you that at a recent meeting the chapter has indorsed your views on the subject of Government operation.

Yours very sincerely,

EDWIN S. BETTELHEIM, Jr., Adjutant.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also wish to have inserted in the RECORD an article published in American Farming, in October, 1927, written by Alfred H. Haag, which is entitled "Why we need a merchant marine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

WHY WE NEED A MERCHANT MARINE—INDISPENSABLE TO EXTEND OUR FOREIGN TRADE AND GUARD NATIONAL SAFETY

By Alfred H. Haag, director department of international shipping, Georgetown University

Probably the most vital issue confronting the American people to-day is the much-discussed shipping problem.

The apparent lack of appreciation on the part of the American people of this issue is primarily due to the insidious propaganda that is and has been waged against any move toward the establishment of a permanent and adequate merchant marine owned, controlled, and operated by the American people. It is high time that they realize that most articles which have been published opposing the upbuilding of our merchant marine are nothing more or less than artful foreign propaganda.

American ships of commerce are an economic necessity and an indispensable factor as an auxiliary to our Navy in times of national emergency.

It is inconceivable that the richest nation in the world, with a wealth of \$400,000,000,000 and an international trade of almost \$10,000,000,000 annually, with freight revenues for transporting this trade amounting to \$600,000,000 per annum, can not support a merchant marine of the best-equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce. The fact is that to-day 70 per cent of our international trade is carried in foreign-flag ships.

Flag-waving arguments have no effect in influencing American shippers to use American-flag ships, and will have none until such time as our flag waves from the ensign staff of a ship offering the same advantages in speed, regularity, and frequency of sailings as that offered by our competitors. Not until that time can we be assured of the full support of American shippers; nor is it fair or reasonable for us to expect them to accept inferior commercial service under the guise of patriotism.

The postwar trend has been toward cargo-liner service—that is, a port to port service, in contradistinction to tramp service—and this service now represents 75 per cent of the world's merchant tonnage. Our competitors were quick to recognize this trend and have either built or acquired modern tonnage with increased speeds and other economic advantages, so that to-day we are far behind in this respect.

During the period from 1921 to 1926 the principal maritime nations built for transoceanic service vessels of 2,000 gross tons and over, totaling approximately as follows:

Country	Number of vessels	Gross tons
Great Britain.....	600	3,500,000
Germany.....	172	950,000
Italy.....	63	506,000
France.....	72	450,000
Japan.....	62	250,000
United States.....	14	137,000
Total.....	973	5,793,000

Or for every 1 ship of this class that the United States has built Great Britain has built approximately 42, Germany 12, France 5, Italy 4, and Japan 4.

Of ships building or contracted for at the present time, of the same class and service, the records disclose that for every 1 ship of this class that the United States is building or has contracted for at the present time Great Britain is building or has contracted for 35, Germany 12, Italy 7, Japan 5, and France 2.

Another striking comparison is in the number and speed of vessels, suitable for transoceanic service, registered under the flag of the principal maritime nations.

Ships of 12 knots and over: Great Britain 1,280, France 277, United States 235, Japan 206, Italy 186, Germany 153.

In this class we rank third, being outclassed by our principal competitor, Great Britain, 5 to 1. Of ships 20 knots and over, Great Britain attains an advantage of 6 to 1.

The foregoing illustrates very definitely our weakness in efficient ocean carriers compared with our principal competitor nations. Even Germany has been able to establish herself as a formidable competitor in the world's trade routes. In her fleet of to-day over 60 per cent of her total tonnage is less than five years old with the economic supremacy that that implies.

We seem to be content to operate ships which were constructed to meet a war emergency and unless a policy of replacement is adopted immediately we shall soon fade from the picture and again have to rely on our active competitors to carry our commerce to and from the ports of the world.

American shipping costs more, due to higher construction and operating costs, and we are adding to that handicap by operating obsolete types of vessels in competition with the faster and more modern types of our competitors. It is vitally necessary to embark immediately on a new construction program to provide our Nation with competitive types of commerce carrier.

It seems rather inconsistent for this Nation to have scrapped 850,000 tons of naval vessels (many of them the most modern types of fighting ships), and with it world naval supremacy, at a cost of almost \$400,000,000 and then hold on like grim death to obsolete types of merchant ships while other nations have disposed of their inefficient ships without delay.

At the Washington Arms Conference in 1922 the United States made a sincere effort to assist other nations to curtail their expenditures by acquiescing in the apparent desire for world disarmament; and we proved our absolute sincerity in agreeing to and complying with the scrapping program. We even consented to one of the Washington treaty nations constructing capital ships after the Washington conference. In addition to this, when we glance over the world's shipbuilding activities for the past five years, we find all the nations who participated in the treaty have far outbuilt this country in combatant types of vessels. And to-day we are considerably below the naval strength agreed to at the Washington Arms Conference, which in spirit and principle was intended to cover all types of fighting ships. The American people most certainly felt that the strength of their Navy should be at least the equal of that of any of the Washington treaty nations. But after five years we find that we are trailing far behind.

It is astounding the progress our competitor nations have made in the upbuilding of their merchant and naval fleets, particularly since the signing of the Washington treaty; and it would be rather interesting to know how far American dollars have aided other nations in the strengthening of their sea power.

Of the \$12,000,000,000 in private American loans, it is reasonable to assume that American dollars have aided these nations considerably in furnishing their shipyards with work in the construction of modern commerce carriers and naval vessels with which American ships must compete. It would seem that after all "Uncle Shylock" is a most liberal individual in assisting his friends across the seas, and it is high time that some consideration be given to our problems at home, particularly that of our sea power, which vitally affects the welfare of the entire Nation, both from an economic standpoint as well as that of national security.

If our Nation is to continue to prosper, it is highly essential that the American people awaken to the fact that American ships of commerce are an absolute necessity, not only to insure American industries uninterrupted ocean transportation in carrying their surplus products to the markets of the world, but to insure the continuous flow of our inbound commerce essential to industry.

In the matter of national defense it is obviously necessary that we have an adequate fleet of commerce carriers to support our Navy, as it is the combined strength of both the naval and merchant fleet that reflects the sea power. They are one and inseparable, and if we are to live up to American traditions and ideals our sea power must be second to none.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a short letter from Mr. Malcom M. Stewart, chairman of the Middle West Foreign Trade Committee, inclosing a bulletin

which is entitled "A middle-west view of present shipping situation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the papers will be inserted in the RECORD.

The communications are as follows:

MIDDLE WEST FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE,  
Cincinnati, Ohio, December 19, 1927.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: The advance copy of our December bulletin will be interesting to you, and I would appreciate it very much if you have any comments to make you would give me the benefit of your reaction.

Very truly yours,

MALCOM M. STEWART, Chairman.

MIDDLE WEST FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE,  
Cincinnati, Ohio, December 22, 1927.

#### A MIDDLE WEST VIEW OF PRESENT SHIPPING SITUATION

To the members of the Middle West Foreign Trade Committee and others interested:

I attach copy of the resolutions adopted by the Middle West Foreign Trade and Merchant Marine Conference, held under the auspices of our committee at St. Louis on November 16, 1927. The action taken by the conference is in accord with the policies adopted and advocated by our committee during the past several years.

#### TO MAKE EFFORTS EFFECTIVE

In order to make effective the work of our organization it is essential that our members do everything they can to further the policies we are constantly and consistently supporting. Your Senators and Representatives want your views on these questions, particularly at this time when the Congress must take some action on the merchant-marine question. I urge therefore that you immediately request your Senators and Representatives to support the policies advocated by our recent conference.

I desire also to call to your particular attention statements made recently by the President on the merchant marine. We were hopeful the President would at this time come out for some definite aid for the merchant marine and would recommend that in the meantime the Congress do whatever might be necessary to keep our shipping services efficiently maintained and on a par with those operated under foreign flags.

#### ONE VIEW BY THE PRESIDENT

In his message to the Congress on December 6 the President has this, and only this, to say on the vital merchant-marine question:

"The United States Government fleet is transporting a large amount of freight and reducing its drain on the Treasury. The Shipping Board is constantly under pressure, to which it too often yields, to protect private interests rather than serve the public welfare. More attention should be given to merchant ships as an auxiliary to the Navy. The possibility of including their masters and crews in the Naval Reserve, with some reasonable compensation, should be thoroughly explored as a method of encouraging private operation of shipping. Public operation is not a success. No investigation, of which I have caused several to be made, has failed to report that it could not succeed or to recommend speedy transfer to private ownership. Our exporters and importers are both indifferent about using American ships. It should be our policy to keep our present vessels in repair and dispose of them as rapidly as possible rather than undertake any new construction. Their operation is a burden on the National Treasury, for which we are not receiving sufficient benefits."

#### ANOTHER VIEW BY THE PRESIDENT

On the same day in an address to the members of the Republican National Committee the President is quoted as follows:

"Waterways and harbors, however, are useless without ships. Our Government operation of our merchant marine has been helpful in many ways, but it is far lacking of complete success. It would be much cheaper and far more beneficial to get it into private hands under some system of Government support which would enable it to meet the lower costs of building and lower rates of wages of foreign shipping."

#### PRESIDENT'S VIEWS UNDEFINED

We do not know what the President had in mind when he stated the Shipping Board too often yields to pressure to protect private interests. We do know that very recently a majority of the Shipping Board refused to yield to private interests who wanted certain lines on terms that would be contrary to the direct mandate of the merchant marine act, 1920, and for which action the members of the Shipping Board are being severely criticized by those interested.

#### IMPORTERS AND EXPORTERS NOT INDIFFERENT

We do not believe our exporters and importers are indifferent about using American ships, but we do think constant agitation to get the



Government out of the shipping business, before sufficient aids are given private enterprises to take over the lines, is not helping the patronage of our lines.

#### UNDUE PRESSURE ON SHIPPING BOARD

Constant efforts are made by people who want to get the Government out of the shipping business to make it appear that the law directs the Shipping Board to sell all vessels, regardless of the consequences. The law clearly directs the Shipping Board first to establish and maintain the merchant marine and, second, to sell the lines to private companies if by such sales the primary purpose of the law can be attained.

#### NECESSARY TO FOREIGN TRADE

With all due respect to the President, we maintain that the operation of the American merchant marine, either by private enterprise or by the Government, is of vital necessity to the proper growth of our foreign trade and for our national defense, and that the benefits derived from this operation even by the Government far exceed the burden on the Treasury. The expenditures for our shipping services are comparable to the appropriations made for our Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce for the promotion of our foreign trade. And we find a vast majority of our people support this view.

#### NO BURDEN ON TREASURY OR TAXPAYERS

Until some form of aid is given by the Government to enable private enterprise to permanently maintain all of our essential shipping services, we strongly urge that the Government continue the operation of the services through private American companies who have the support of the communities served, and that the Congress from time to time authorize whatever new construction may be necessary to efficiently maintain the lines, the cost of such new construction to come from the construction loan fund of the Shipping Board, and with no call on either the Treasury or the taxpayers.

This is no commitment to permanent Government ownership and operation, but it is a most definite commitment to a permanent, efficient American merchant marine.

And as long as the Government remains in the shipping business we favor the retention of the regional United States Shipping Board to maintain the services. This board was created by the Congress as an independent body to manage our merchant marine and it was never contemplated that the President should direct the policies of the board any more than he would the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Shipping Board represents the views of all sections of our country, not alone one section, on this all-important question.

Your Senators and Representatives will appreciate your views. I would be pleased to hear from you on this question.

MALCOLM M. STEWART, *Chairman.*

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like also to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Mr. H. B. Arledge, special representative of the Middle West Foreign Trade Committee, dated November 26, 1927, written to Mr. C. A. Swope, secretary, Traffic Club of New York, in reply to some questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE—VIEWS OF MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTHERN INTERESTS IN CONNECTION WITH ADDRESS BEFORE TRAFFIC CLUB OF NEW YORK BY IRA A. CAMPBELL, OF AMERICAN STEAMSHIP OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

MIDDLE WEST FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE,  
Washington, D. C., November 26, 1927.

Mr. C. A. SWOPE,  
*Secretary of Traffic Club of New York,  
Waldorf Astoria, New York City.*

MY DEAR MR. SWOPE: As a member of the Traffic Club of New York, who is greatly interested in the development of our foreign trade and the maintenance of the American merchant marine, I desire to make a few comments on these subjects in connection with the address of Mr. Ira A. Campbell, general counsel of the American Steamship Owners' Association, before the club on October 25, and which address has recently been distributed to the members in pamphlet form.

I am writing particularly from the viewpoint of Middle Western and Southern commercial people with whom I am actively associated. I spent a number of years in the North Atlantic with the Pennsylvania Railroad System. The Middle West and South want nothing more than an equality of opportunity with our other sections and ports, and we have usually found most of our New York friends in accord with our efforts.

It has been clearly demonstrated on many occasions that the majority of the American people are in complete accord with the declaration in the preamble of the merchant marine act 1920 that "for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels." A majority of the people heard on this question have stated that they prefer the merchant

marine to be under private ownership and operation, but until it is possible for private enterprise to take over for permanent maintenance the essential lines they desire the Government to continue the present policy of having the Shipping Board operate the services through private American companies.

It is generally admitted, and it was quite conclusively shown during the subsidy campaign of 1922, in which campaign I took an active part in an effort to secure aids for private owners, that American ships can not compete on equal terms in foreign trade with vessels operating under foreign flags. In view of this fact, why should any of the essential cargo lines that are now being maintained by the Shipping Board—lines that carry no mail and which could not benefit from any mail subsidy such as referred to by Mr. Campbell—be sold with only a stipulation that the purchaser must continue the service for a mere five years. If a purchaser did maintain the service for five years and during that time Congress granted no substantial aid to private American shipping companies, it is a hundred-to-one shot that upon the expiration of the five years the purchaser would discontinue the service and place the vessels in some profitable trade, probably our protected coastwise trade. Then the Shipping Board would likely be without suitable vessels with which to reestablish the service and the American merchant marine in foreign trade would soon be only a memory. It is a fairly safe guess that most of the Shipping Board services that have been sold under five-year guarantees of operation to which Mr. Campbell referred will be discontinued upon the expiration of the guaranty periods.

Why is it not best to continue the present method of operation until the Congress does grant the necessary aid and then turn the lines over to private enterprise, instead of trying to force sales at this time that are not sound. In the interim we can continue under the merchant marine act, 1920, urging Congress to make good the declaration in that act by the appropriation of sufficient funds for operations, reconditioning of some of the present vessels and construction of new vessels that are urgently needed to place our lines on a parity with our foreign competitors. We can not expect our producers and receivers to patronize lines that are inferior to those used by their competitors. Funds for this construction could be taken from the construction loan fund of the board, with no call on the taxpayers. This fund was created and still exists for the purpose of making loans to private American shipping companies, but no such companies are seeking loans to construct vessels for foreign service.

Surely this is no commitment to permanent Government ownership and operation, but it is a very definite commitment to a permanent American merchant marine.

The Shipping Board lines are not competing with any private American lines, regardless of statements that are sometimes made to the contrary, and these lines are necessary for the proper growth of our commerce. Constant improvement is being made by the Shipping Board and its private American managing agents in the operation of these lines, and instead of attempting to belittle their efforts and suggest arguments for foreign lines to use against us we should solidly support the board and its agents. The public deals with these private companies, and the relations between the public and these private American operating companies can and should be the same as if the lines were privately owned.

Mr. Campbell quoted from section 7 of the merchant marine act, 1920, to the effect that the board should not continue to operate the lines unless it appears that within a reasonable time they can be made self-sustaining. He apparently overlooked further down in this section the provision that lines being then maintained by the board shall be maintained until in the opinion of the board the maintenance thereof is against the public interests. It is also an error to assume that the primary purpose of the merchant marine act, 1920, is to sell the vessels. The primary purpose is clearly stated to be the establishment and maintenance of the American merchant marine and the secondary purpose is to sell the vessels if the primary purpose can be attained by such sales.

The funds spent on our merchant marine are comparable to the expenditures made by our excellent Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce, all for the purpose of developing our foreign trade. We do not believe in giving up something we have for something we may have for only five years or less.

We supported the merchant marine act, 1920, and the subsidy bill of 1922, and we will support any proper measure that will enable private American shipping companies to compete on equal terms with their foreign competitors. And in the meantime we will continue to urge the proper and efficient maintenance of our present lines and services and close cooperation with the Shipping Board and its private managing agents in carrying out the mandate of the Congress in the merchant marine act, 1920.

I earnestly urge the members of our club to stand by and support the board and its agents until it is possible to turn our lines over to private enterprise for permanent maintenance. I am sure none of us is impressed by Mr. Campbell's comparison of our Government-owned

shipping to a Russian-owned shoe-manufacturing business. It is not even comparable to our late-lamented Railroad Administration. The Government owns the ships and operates them through private American companies who have the support of the local communities served, and under present conditions we can not hope to retain these essential services under any other plan.

I commend the subject to the careful consideration of the members of our club.

Very truly yours,

H. B. ARLEDGE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Southern Ruralist of April 1, 1927. Mr. C. A. Cobb, the editor of that paper, has written quite a number of editorials on this subject, and has a vision and a far-sightedness that is quite refreshing. What he says is to the point, and is so clearly and admirably expressed that it shows he has a full comprehension of the importance of an American merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

#### SHIPPING BOARD RIGHT

The United States Shipping Board has very properly turned down the ridiculously low bids for our great passenger ships—the *Leviathan*, the best ship in the world, among them—and for the freight ships of the American merchant lines. It took great courage to successfully beat off the concerted attacks of foreign owning and operating interests and those private interests here in our own country who would preempt the seas for themselves and who have gone so far as to urge the Government to sink our ships if necessary to get the Government out of the "shipping business." There hasn't been a bid they have not urged the Government with all their power to accept, however inadequate, however irresponsible, or however much money it would lose the American people. What they have wanted above all else has been to get the Government out of their way. As to consequences, they seem not to care a whit.

We are not the United States we were back in 1914. We are the great creditor Nation now and the whole world is in debt to us. Industrially, through war pressure and demand born of the war, we moved into first place among the nations of the world and the whole world is our competitor. Agriculturally, we for a long time have been the greatest export Nation in the world. The world is our agricultural market. Without our own transportation facilities we would be at the mercy of those nations that are fighting for the business we feel that we must have. Handling the commerce of the world, they would divide the business of the world among themselves.

Every nation in Europe is struggling mightily for industrial as well as agricultural independence. These are the same nations that hauled the ocean-borne freight of the world before the war. Can we trust them to handle ours and theirs now? Would they haul our goods to their markets to compete with products of their own industries and own farms? It is different with cotton, to a degree. The world must come to us for that. But what price would we pay were we off the seas and at the mercy of foreign shipping interests? Fortunately, we have a little light on that matter that is surprisingly important.

Back in the fall of 1926 practically all available tonnage was withdrawn from general service in order to haul coal to Great Britain. You will recall that the miners of that country had at the time been on a strike for a long time and that the nation's coal supplies had been completely exhausted and that she had to come to the United States for relief. The demand for coal-carrying space sent carrying charges soaring. Not only that, except for the fact that we had our own boats there would have been none for cotton or wheat or the other products of agriculture which are more difficult to handle and more expensive to handle than coal, and which in large quantities must be moved in the fall of the year.

To show how attractive the coal cargo is, take the case of a ship of 8,800 dead-weight ton capacity. Such a ship carrying coal from Norfolk to the British Isles in October and November, the season of peak cotton movement, brought the operator \$67,500. That same ship hauling cotton from Savannah or Charleston would have returned the operator a gross of only \$41,000. And while the boat carrying coal would have delivered its cargo "free in and out," the vessel loaded with cotton would have had to bear cost of stevedoring here and abroad, and the loss of time in loading and unloading. These extra costs would run to around \$7,000, leaving only \$34,000 to go to the operator of the vessel carrying cotton. Take this \$34,000 from the \$67,500 earned by the vessel carrying coal and the difference is \$33,500 in favor of coal. No private concern in the world could have been expected to turn down any such sum as that in order to save the cotton grower or the wheat grower from whatever calamity might befall him.

And yet our Government did that very thing, and in so doing rendered the Nation a service the value of which defies calculation in dollars and cents. With the prospects of a tremendous oversupply of cotton, the situation was bad enough. We shudder at the thought of what it would

have been had there been no boats to haul that cotton. We have only to recall the distress of 1914 to get a fairly clear picture of the situation we would have had to face. We don't want 1914 any more!

During the period from July to October, Shipping Board boats moved 16,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour from Gulf ports, chiefly to points in Europe. During September and October Shipping Board vessels moved approximately a million bales of cotton from Gulf ports. From July to late fall the Shipping Board made available and assigned a total of 92 vessels for use in moving agricultural products to foreign countries.

Doesn't this justify us in opposing with all vigor the junking of our ships? Hasn't the fact been convincingly demonstrated that this Nation must have its own carrier service? Isn't the farmer's interest as great or even greater than that of anybody else? And aren't we right in rejoicing that the Shipping Board has at last turned a deaf ear to those selfish souls—principally a little group in the East—who seem utterly oblivious to the fact that there are others than themselves? Aren't the facts so overwhelmingly favorable as to put to shame those who unwittingly have attempted to discredit the work of the Shipping Board and the handling of our merchant fleet?

We must have an efficient merchant marine. If private capital won't give it to us—and private capital seems utterly unwilling to make a move in that direction without huge Government subsidy—then we must have Government operation, operation in the interest of safety and service to all.

Here's hoping that the wishy-washy policy of the administration toward this great problem is at an end, and that courage, definiteness, firmness, and a sense of broad national service will characterize the attitude from now on. We need that above all things else.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also ask that an editorial appearing in the Southern Ruralist of June 15, 1927, and entitled "More ships and better service," be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

#### MORE SHIPS, BETTER SERVICE

It has gradually been driven home to the administration at Washington that the American public is thoroughly sold to the firm establishment of an American merchant marine that will meet the needs of the American shipping public. The dillydallying attitude that has characterized the administration of our merchant marine from the executive end will be tolerated no longer, and neither will our people stand complacently by and see ships that cost millions given away to private enterprises or junked. These ships are just as precious to the American public now during peace times as they were during the war, and they can do just as much to solve the problems of the producing public of America as they did to win the war. In no uncertain terms those who staged the investigation sponsored by the Shipping Board throughout the country last summer were told that we must have ships and ships a plenty.

Our first preference was for private ownership, but if there were no private concerns who could step in and do the job in a thoroughgoing manner with justice to every section, then the public would look to the Government itself to move forward with shipbuilding and ship operation without delay. It is interesting to see that public opinion, which is all but unanimous throughout the country now as to the value of our own shipping service, is about to bring forth a definite plan and establish a definite policy. The mean things that have been said about the inability of the Government to profitably operate ships have definitely been discredited. Government ships have not only established new lines but are actually showing a profit in the midst of the keenest competition the world has even seen and rendering a type of service that could not and would not have been possible had the merchant ships of the Nation been in other hands. It has taken the unlimited ability of the Nation itself to do what has been done.

In spite, however, of the fact that our ships have made good as carriers of the products of commerce and in spite of the fact that they have saved this Nation countless millions of dollars that would have been sacrificed had we had no merchant marine, there are those who still insist that the Government must get out of the shipping business even if the ships have to be taken out to the deep sea and sunk. Realizing that a definite policy is going to be worked out during the next session of Congress, enemies of our merchant marine, chiefly private ship-operating concerns of the East, are already seeking every opportunity to do injury to our merchant marine however slight the pretext.

Nothing more clearly demonstrates this fact than the recent utterances of J. A. Campbell, president of the Youngstown Sheet Metal Co., Youngstown, Pa. A little while ago at the annual meeting of the stockholders of his company he took occasion, according to published accounts of his address, to denounce the Shipping Board for hauling steel products from Antwerp, Belgium, to New York at \$2.85 per ton when the North Atlantic conference freight rate was \$4 per ton for the same service. It has developed since his statement was made, which was given very wide publicity and which was pointed out by



eastern papers as reflecting the inefficiency and impotency of our American merchant marine service, that the actual rates charged were not as Mr. Campbell had said they were, but that no steel had been hauled from Antwerp to North American ports below rates ranging from \$4.50 to \$6.75 per ton. Had Mr. Campbell taken the trouble to get the facts from the records he would not have been guilty of the gross injustice with which he has been credited. The fact is, the Shipping Board is scrupulously meeting its responsibilities and deserves to be presented to the American public in the true light.

It is doubtless true that Mr. Campbell was sincerely at fault. He undoubtedly was retelling what he had heard, and doubtless heard from a source more directly interested than himself. In this connection we are told by authoritative sources in the Capital City of the Nation itself that the forces of opposition will visit Washington in all their power during the next session of Congress to see to it that our ships are junked if necessary to accomplish their purpose. We can not conceive of our Government being misled into agreeing to a policy that can be characterized accurately as nothing less than wholesale vandalism. The American people will not stand for it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I also should like to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Southern Ruralist of September 1, 1927, entitled "Without ships we lose," and an editorial from the same publication of the issue of October 15, 1927, entitled "The public not to blame."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

#### WITHOUT SHIPS WE LOSE

As the success of our merchant marine disperses the smoke screen of opposition it is clearer than ever that one of the most urgent needs of the farmer is ample ships flying the American flag to carry his wares to customers abroad. Having had no ships for generations, our people, especially those of the interior, have had little opportunity to know about the value of a merchant fleet. Not knowing of its value, more often than not they were opposed to any attempts by the Government to establish a merchant fleet capable of demonstrating the value of such an institution to our people.

The World War taught us a lesson, one certainly that we should not soon forget. When it broke upon us it found our country without boats, and without boats we found ourselves unable to move those products of the Nation that enter into international trade. The merchant ships of other nations had been called in off the seas to haul soldiers and war supplies. Without ships, cotton, wheat, and tobacco dropped to the lowest price levels for many years, and brought disaster to agriculture throughout the country. Our farmers and others who had export commodities for shipment abroad were not the only losers. The Nation itself, on account of the need for the immediate construction of a merchant fleet, was forced under the pressure of war-time prices and labor conditions to spend countless millions of dollars in constructing boats that could have been built for a fraction of the war-time costs before war was declared. We had to have the ships, however, and could not stand back on expenses.

When the war was over the Government still owned these ships. It still owns a good many hundred, many of which have contributed immeasurably to the stability of agriculture, particularly here in the South. Except for the fact that the Government was able to place ninety-odd ships in the ports of the South last fall when the coal strike in England brought on another crisis similar to that of 1914, the price of cotton would have gone down to 5 or 6 cents again. Wheat and tobacco would have dropped, too. We of the South should always keep the important fact before us that the exports of cotton and tobacco represent more than one-third of the total exports of the whole country. Ships can make us, and lack of ships can break us.

Going back again to 1914, it cost the cotton farmer that year some three-quarters of a billion dollars more to grow the crop than he got for it. This enormous loss was wholly due to the fact that we had no ships. On two or three occasions President Coolidge has called upon the other great powers to join in a program of disarmament. Up to the present these conferences have been largely without desirable results. The most recent, the one held in Geneva a few weeks ago, was tragic in its ending, leaving the way open for competitive building of great navies. Already Congressmen and Senators are talking about the battleships that must be constructed to bring the American fleet up to an equality with the British fleet. All of this may be necessary. We do not know. Certainly the people of the Nation and their interests must be adequately protected. But to the naval expert and the armament builder protection is one thing and to the statesman it is another. The unfortunate thing is that naval experts instead of statesmen dominated the Geneva meeting. The call in 1914 was not for more battleships but for merchantmen. It was that call that gave us our great merchant fleet, of which we still have a remnant sufficiently large for foundation purposes and that must be preserved. In another emergency of similar character the call would undoubtedly again be for a merchant fleet. Again we urge that we strive by all reasonable means at our command to preserve the merchant fleet we have.

A merchant fleet will function 365 days in every year in the interest of the agriculture, commerce, and industry of the Nation, war or no war. Money spent on a merchant marine will be money that will bring a definite return every year whether there is war or peace. That can not be said, certainly to the same degree, of a battle fleet. A merchant fleet is clearly a constructive force, a building force, serving not only to protect the people in an emergency such as we had in 1914 and again in the fall of the past year, but to make us absolutely free at all times to carry our commerce where and when we will. Such a fleet is imperative if we are to build up all the ports and efficiently serve all the sections of the entire Nation. In spite of this very obvious fact, we had no merchant-fleet policy when the war was over, and what is even more tragic, we still have none, and the Stars and Stripes will be forced off the seas and the whole Nation placed back in its former helpless condition unless the people themselves rise up and demand that something definite be done toward establishing our fleet on a permanent basis once and for all. When the war was over there was an enormous hue and cry for the junking of our boats, and many actually went to the scrap heap. Those same forces are bringing every possible influence to bear upon Congress and upon the administration to force the Shipping Board and all its interests out of business. Private interests at home and merchant fleet owners abroad have joined hands to this end. In spite of all opposition, however, our merchant fleet, though greatly depleted in the number of ships, is making good—making good under conditions that might normally be expected to hopelessly destroy any sort of commercial enterprise. In spite of that fact, however, we have moved forward, and as stated already, our merchant fleet has made and is making its rich contribution to agriculture and all other industries alike.

So, again, war or no war, we must have a merchant fleet. War or no war, a merchant marine is one of the most pressing needs, not only of agriculture but of the entire industry of the Nation. Money that goes into the building and upkeep of battleships might be wasted, but money that goes into merchant ships will bring a rich return.

#### THE PUBLIC NOT TO BLAME

President Coolidge, according to recent White House news dispatches, is greatly disappointed at the lack of public interest in our merchant marine. He can not understand the indifference, and feels that lack of keener public interest has been and is now the greatest handicap to the successful operation of our merchant fleet.

A little while ago officials of the United States Shipping Board spent a month or so in the field holding public hearings. These hearings were held for the specific purpose of determining definitely the attitude of the public toward our fleet of merchant vessels—what the public wanted the Government to do. These meetings called out the thinking leaders in all phases of our agricultural and industrial life. They were held in every section of the country. Out of these hearings came the overwhelming and unqualified demand: Give us an adequate merchant marine. Let us have it under private operation if possible, but if that is not possible, then let the Government give us an adequate merchant marine—that was the public answer.

The opinion was emphatically voiced at these meetings that the shifting indefiniteness of the administration was the one great difficulty, and that until the negative, positionless policy of the powers that be in Washington was changed to one of positive action and definite policy the public would have little basis upon which to build confidence. For a long time it has very clearly been a case of lack of leadership at Washington and not public apathy that is to blame for the alleged indifference of the people. Had the President and his associates in power realized the need of the hour and had he and they taken a definite stand and laid down a definite policy, a different story would be to tell to-day. If the President's statement is a forerunner to the adoption of a definite and vigorous policy, he need not worry about the response of the public, for the public is convinced as never before in history of the vital need of an adequate tonnage of merchant vessels.

In this connection it is deeply gratifying to those who have realized the vital importance of a merchant marine and who have helped the Shipping Board fight its battles through these years of greatest trials that our boats are making good. It is remarkable that our fleet has been kept afloat and efficiently functioning in the interest of our international trade in spite of an antagonistic administration, and while in the hands of officers chosen for the purpose of scrapping the whole outfit. But it has made good in spite of all of these.

Administration leaders who have fought the building of a merchant marine are returning from investigations abroad. They left this country with the feeling that the fight they had made in the Halls of Congress to scrap our boats was in line with the best interests of the people. Back from Europe, however, where they had opportunity to study our country in the light of its relationship to other countries of the world, where they have seen our commerce in international trade, and where they have witnessed first-hand the reshaping processes of competitors, they tell us that if the United States is to hold a respectable position in international trade that we have got

to have our own boats. They tell us that the life of our international trade, because of developments overseas and because of the negative policy at Washington, hangs by a thread, and that if for any reason official Washington is unable to reverse its attitude and proceed promptly to build up an adequate fleet of merchant vessels that serious economic reverses are ahead of us.

Senator WESLEY L. JONES, of Washington, puts it this way: "No merchant marine means the destruction of our commerce by the ruthlessness of foreign competitors, and we have learned by sad and expensive experience the necessity of having a fleet in time of war." The foregoing is about in line with what other responsible students of the problem are saying. As a matter of fact, it is so nearly what they all say that it would serve as a sort of unanimous quotation.

One of our most widely read New York business writers has swung around to the position where he believes "that the greatest opportunity for the capture of world trade since the war now is opening before the Shipping Board." Such a statement coming from that quarter—the stronghold of the opposition—would have been regarded as rank heresy had it been made three or four years ago, when we knew less than we know now about the position this country occupies in world affairs.

All of which brings us back to the point that we made in the beginning. The trouble with the building of an adequate fleet of vessels lies at the doors of the White House and not at the doors of the public. The White House has not even thrown the poor dog a bone, to say nothing of giving it the attention and support it deserves. In spite of his protestations, Mr. Coolidge has no alibis. And in spite of all opposition we are going to have our own boats. The people will see to that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, 12 years ago, on November 12, 1915, I delivered an address at a dinner of the Academy of Political Science in New York. The closing portion of that address I would repeat now. In my judgment it is applicable to the situation in which we find ourselves to-day. Without reading it, I ask to have the last page of the address inserted in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Thought, however mature, conviction, however deep, get us nowhere until they begin to operate in will and act. Merely recounting with reiteration the deplorable situation, and nothing more, evidences a species of cynicism, an unhealthy state of mind—lays no keels.

There never was a time when a change in shipping conditions would be less disturbing and more advantageous than right now. Now is the best possible time to inaugurate such changes. Nothing will be gained by delay. We have all the information upon which to act. Satisfaction with present conditions means a sacrifice of golden opportunities and an inexcusable lack of proper conception of our responsibilities.

Monetary and trade supremacy had its inception on the banks of the Nile. It moved westward to the shores of the Mediterranean and thence further westward out into the open sea of commercial activity. It passed from Portugal to Spain, then to Holland, then to France, and then to England. Venice, Lisbon, Amsterdam, Antwerp succeeded each other as centers; then London, the frontier town of the Middle Ages, at last supplanted them all.

The earlier struggles were directed to the attainment of some particular national supremacy, and that was to be founded on monopoly. That meant trouble. But the distinctive feature of commerce to-day is its international character. It is not a question of monopoly or particular supremacy; it is a question in large measure of leadership, and in this the factors are natural advantages, better methods, better facilities of exchange, efficient and economical service, a sound currency and financial influence, and the freest markets. I have seen it averred that in all the world's history nothing has had lasting importance like trade. Pitt declared, "British rule is British trade." Chamberlain expressed the same thought in the statement, "The empire is commerce."

The marvelous resources of the United States, her financial strength and facilities, the awakening of the East and the promising outlook in Latin America, the Isthmian Canal, the opportunities for forming new commercial ties, the relations founded on a better understanding, and mutual good will toward all the world mean, if we but discharge our responsibilities, the establishment of commanding centers of trade in the United States and drawing westward again commercial leadership.

The great English poet and dramatist gives us this picture:  
Antonio is sad. Salarino says to him:

"Your mind is tossing on the ocean,  
There, where your argosies with portly sail,  
Like signiors and rich burghers on the flood,  
Or, as it were, the pageants of the sea,  
Do overpeer the petty traffickers,  
That curtsy to them, do them reverence,  
As they fly by them with their woven wings."

To which Antonio replies:

"Believe me, no; I thank my fortune for it,  
My ventures are not in one bottom trusted,  
Nor to one place; nor is my whole estate  
Upon the fortune of this present year,  
Therefore, my merchandise makes me not sad."

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I think the Senator from Florida is to be congratulated upon the very interesting and able address which he has just concluded. I hope it will engage the attention of Senators. We have many problems which need to be solved, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out. There will be legislation proposed, and if we are to have a merchant marine to carry on our commerce and also as a means of national defense, there must be early action. Whether we agree or not with the Senator from Florida in his definite conclusions, we can not, as patriots and as citizens of this great country, disagree with the conclusion that it is vital to the national welfare to preserve and maintain an effective merchant marine.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, and Mr. LANHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATERMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KEYES. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the bill and agree to the conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KEYES, Mr. WARREN, Mr. FESS, Mr. REED of Missouri, and Mr. ASHURST conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I understand the Senate is soon to adjourn until Monday. I am very sorry that this step is to be taken, for there is a tremendously grave and unfortunate situation confronting our country at this hour. American boys are now being killed in Nicaragua. We have no right, moral or legal, to use an armed force in Nicaragua; no just cause or lawful excuse. We are violating the constitution of Nicaragua and we are violating the Constitution of the United States by the presence and activities of our armed forces in our neighboring Republic of Nicaragua.

A most remarkable situation confronts the American people. The President is conducting a war down there, and has been conducting it for months, without ever consulting Congress. Congress met on the 5th of December last, but the war proceeds through Executive orders without the lawmaking body of the Nation ever being consulted. I am not willing to permit the Senate to adjourn until Monday without giving some Senators an opportunity to protest against this unlawful and un-American conduct. I do not want to see another American boy killed in this war in Nicaragua. L. C. Russell, a fine American boy from my State, has been killed down there. He was forced to go out against natives of Nicaragua who were fighting for self-government; forced to fight against natives who were seeking to drive out of their statehouse an impostor and usurper; forced to fight against natives who were seeking to remove from the office of President the man who with armed bandits drove the President of Nicaragua out of office.

Mr. President, it looks as if this Government is entering very fast upon the road to imperialism. It looks like our Army is now being used to collect the debts of Wall Street financiers. I wonder if Washington and his ragged Continentals, who left their bloody foot tracks in the snow at Valley Forge ever thought that they were fighting to establish a government that would one day become the handy instrument of predatory wealth and a collecting agency for men who put their filthy lucre above the welfare of their country and the lives of its soldiers?



Nicaragua is a sovereign nation, separate and apart from our own. We have no right to go there with an army and force our will upon the people of Nicaragua. We have already incurred the ill will and hostility of nearly all of the Central and South American nations by our foolish and unwarranted war upon the people of Nicaragua. And we are digging up snakes perhaps that we will be unable to kill for years to come. Think of it! Peaceful, liberty-loving America butchering her men on Nicaraguan soil in a war with the patriotic natives who are fighting for self-government, for the same principles that our fathers fought for in the War of the Revolution. And what is the sentiment of Nicaragua with regard to this situation?

The sentiment of the masses of Nicaragua is overwhelmingly against Diaz and his fostered government.

They have recently had elections in the various municipalities of Nicaragua. I hold in my hand a copy of a splendid magazine published here in Washington, entitled "The New Age." It contains an article written by Dr. Albert H. Putney, director of the school of political science of the American University, Washington, D. C. It is the December number of the magazine, and in the article to which I have referred Mr. Putney tells us:

Recent municipal elections in Nicaragua resulted in an overwhelming victory for the Liberal Party.

And yet, in spite of that, Mr. President, we are down there with our troops fighting to sustain and keep in power the minority party—a bastard régime—holding an impostor in the office of President by the armed forces of this great liberty-loving Government of the western world. It is simply outrageous. The fathers and mothers of this Nation have a right to protest against such irregular, outrageous, and inexcusable conduct.

In the face of this grave and serious national situation why are we going to adjourn until Monday? Is it for the purpose of giving the administration a chance with the Senate adjourned to rush more American boys down there to be killed in one big effort to overpower with overwhelming numbers the natives who are fighting for home rule and self-government? They are working fast. The newspapers tell us this morning that the Diaz government has applied for a loan from Wall Street. So Wall Street is to furnish the money to help buy the presidential election in Nicaragua, and American soldiers with guns and bayonets are to patrol the streets about the ballot boxes, intimidate the Liberals, and do their bit to help Diaz control the election.

It is worse than the force bill which a Republican Congress undertook to put upon the South in reconstruction days—our Government sending armed forces to hold elections in foreign republics, to keep one faction from voting and aiding the other faction to remain in power. My God, what are we coming to?

Mr. President, I have here a letter from an American father who has just lost a son in the war in Nicaragua. My heart goes out in tender sympathy to him; God bless him and his good wife in their sorrow; their son has been butchered in Nicaragua—let me read the letter?

ST. LOUIS, January 4.

John S. Hemphill, of Ferguson, Mo., a suburb, whose son, Sergt. John F. Hemphill, was killed last Saturday in action between the United States marines and the troops of General Sandino, Nicaraguan rebel, to-day made public an open letter to President Coolidge protesting against what he termed the "disgraceful war" in Nicaragua.

He said:

What we are doing is no less than murder for the sole purpose of keeping in power a puppet President and acting as a collector for Wall Street.

Mr. President, that is the way an American patriot and father feels about this terrible thing. His son has been killed down there in this outrageous, unauthorized, and awful war. Congress has not authorized war in Nicaragua, and yet we are in war down there. We are sending more troops down there now, and instead of doing something to stop it, the Republican Senate has adjourned over to Monday. We should withdraw the marines and bring them out and wash the hands of this Government of it all. That is what we ought to do. We are fast becoming an imperialistic power. We are not going any further on that road without my vigorous protest.

Indeed, I have protested before, but this Nicaraguan affair is the most daring and far-reaching step that we have taken. But let me finish this letter:

My son survived honorable service through the World War against Germany only to be officially murdered in a disgraceful war against this little nation.

I hope enough Senators will join me in this movement to stop this effort to adjourn, that we will stay here and debate this question to-morrow, and let the fathers and mothers whose sons are yet to be killed in a long-drawn-out war in South American countries if this war continues—that some of us were here doing what we could to stop this thing.

Is this strange and unauthorized warfare going on much longer, this war inaugurated by the President and Secretary Kellogg? Are we going to sit here and remain silent while we are in session and permit it to continue? If so, we ought to resign and go home. There are men in the States at home who would protest if they were here. Certain big Wall Street interests who have bought bonds in Nicaragua do not want this question discussed in the Senate. They want to keep the people ignorant as to what is going on in Nicaragua. Be quiet, they whisper, certain financial interests have joined hands with the Roman Catholic Church power in Nicaragua.

Let me give you the facts to back that statement.

Mr. Putney, in this same December article in *The New Age*, says:

The Liberal newspapers in Nicaragua have recently acquired courage to renew attacks upon the control of the schools of their country by Roman Catholic priests, and the great degree of control which the hierarchy exercises over the present Conservative government. A newspaper at Managua (*La Noticia*) has been publishing a series of detailed statements showing the sums of money which the Government has been giving to the Roman Catholics for educational purposes.

This same paper has also published many letters from its subscribers showing the bitter feeling in the minds of the mass of the citizens of Nicaragua against the present union of church and state, with the church as the controlling influence in that country.

Senators, are we going to remain silent and permit these American boys to continue to be butchered in such a cause—an unholy alliance between the money changers of Wall Street and the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Nicaragua? Diaz is a Roman Catholic. He does not represent a majority of the Catholics of Nicaragua. There has been a revolt against this man and his party among many Catholics, and all the other elements are against him. Two-thirds of the people of Nicaragua condemn this bastard government; and yet we, of this great Nation, have our soldiers down there, spending the money of the taxpayers of the Nation, spilling the blood of the best boys in the Republic, and murdering soldiers under the flag for such a cause!

Mr. President, it is time that this country was waking up. I call on other Senators here to express their opposition to this course. I have a resolution pending now in the Foreign Relations Committee calling on the President to withdraw our troops. If we could stay in session, we could get action on it by Monday, and maybe save the lives of many American boys. But if we adjourn, this forum will be closed and no action can be taken. And the devilish work will continue in Nicaragua.

One hundred and fifty-odd years ago this Government was struggling for its liberty. Patrick Henry loved it so well that he said he was willing to die for it. He said, "Give me liberty or give me death." To-day the patriots in Nicaragua who are going up against this great, strong Government love their own land and self-government so well that they are willing to die for it. It is claimed that we have killed hundreds of them, mowed them down like cutting wheat at the harvest time—for what? To protect American rights and interests? No. But what are we doing? Two influences are at work—certain financial interests in Wall Street and the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

I know it will offend some people for me or anyone else to talk that way, but I am going to tell the truth about every question that affects my country. I am not going to be mealy-mouthed about any of these questions when the welfare of my country is involved and the lives of American boys are at stake. I am going to lay my finger on the facts, cost what it may to me personally.

Now, I am going to ask the Committee on Foreign Relations to act at once on my resolution. I know that the great chairman of that committee will do what he can—I believe he will—and I hope the other members will join him. I am going to insist upon action on that resolution. I am going to continue, as best I can, to give the facts to the people of the country.

Thank God, it is still their country, although many of its instrumentalities are becoming paralyzed. Insidious, predatory influences are moving slowly but steadily upon many of the instrumentalities of the Government; and I want to say that I am astounded that we have not had more protests against this bloody, outrageous war that is going on without authority

in Nicaragua. The time was when almost every Senator would have been on his feet denouncing it.

What is the trouble? Are we losing our courage, seeking to move along the lines of least resistance, afraid of the frown of some big influence? Mr. President, no man who puts his political fortunes against the lives of American boys at a time like this is worthy of being in either branch of Congress. We ought to stand here and fight for the rights and the lives of these boys. They can not speak for themselves here. Here is a broken-hearted American father, with crape on the doorpost of his American home, bowed in grief over his dead boy, butchered in Nicaragua, writing the President that this is a disgraceful war, and that the Army has become a collecting agency for Wall Street.

God help the Republican Party if it will not rise to the occasion and help us to deliver this Government out of the clutches of this unholy alliance—out of this miserable and indefensible war in Nicaragua!

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, in 1914 there was a landing of the marines at Vera Cruz, Mexico. The landing was without any authority from Congress, but by the order of the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. The matter was taken up in the other House by resolution similar in character to the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama at this time. Some considerable criticism was made against President Wilson for what was charged at that time to be a step that might lead to war without any authority from Congress.

I was a Member of that body at the time. I very distinctly remember the eloquent address of the Senator from Alabama in denouncing the persons who had taken the position that he is taking to-day; and, to refresh the memory of the country, I want to read from that address of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

In referring to the matter of landing the marines, which was charged by a certain group in the House with which I did not have sympathy at the time, to be an effort to drive from power in Mexico a President, namely, Huerta, a statement to that effect was made by a Republican Member; and the Senator from Alabama used the language I am about to read on the 20th of April, 1914. The World War broke out on the 1st of August, 1914. This has nothing whatever to do with the World War, because no one ever dreamed of a world war in April, 1914.

The eloquent Senator made this statement:

This is a solemn occasion—too solemn for partisan politics—and yet some gentlemen on the Republican side have lugged into this discussion the claptrap rubbish of political desperadoes, so thirsty for the fountains of political power, so hungry for a return of the emoluments of Republican control, and so dead to the demands of patriotic duty that they are willing to embarrass the administration, slander the President, brook indignities upon our soldiers, and insults upon our flag in order to make political capital, to gain partisan advantage.

Further on:

The gentleman now seeks to shackle the feet and manacle the hands of a Democratic President when our dignity and honor are at stake, when our soldiers are humiliated, and our flag insulted by the ungodly and brutal tyrant of Mexico. [Applause.] The gentleman now makes mean insinuations about the motives that prompt this peace-loving, patriotic, Democratic President to uphold the dignity and honor of the American Union.

Further on:

They have denounced his policy of watchful waiting and urged that he should put an end to the terrible conditions in Mexico; and now, when our country, without any fault on her part, is insulted by the self-constituted authority of a murderous and drunken tyrant, the President is criticized and abused by men who, in their desire to serve their party, prove faithless to their country.

Further on:

Mr. Speaker, now that the President of the United States—the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy—has found conditions serious enough to send battleships to Mexican waters, it is the duty of every Member of Congress and of every patriotic American citizen to stand faithfully by him as he goes to uphold the dignity and the honor of this, the greatest Government on the globe.

I commend these words to the Senator at this time.

Mr. HEFLIN. The case cited by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is in no sense on all fours with the present one. At the time to which he refers the President of Mexico had just been murdered. Huerta, his trusted military chief, had butchered him, had killed him in the statehouse, and the outlaws and bandits had taken charge. The Government of Mexico had been overthrown and bandits had attacked American citizens

and seized property of the American Government. It was then that the President landed those troops temporarily. Be it said to his credit, he gave prompt attention to America's rights and interests and then brought the armed forces home. He did not stay there long.

But in the case of Nicaragua the situation is entirely different. No American property had been seized, no American citizen had been attacked. The truth compels us to admit that our soldiers have been used to protect a bastard government over the will of two-thirds of the people of Nicaragua who are seeking to return to national control the officers duly elected by the people of Nicaragua. It is their right and duty to do that. The President started this war in Nicaragua when Congress was not in session, and he continues to carry it on when Congress is in session. He has never obtained the consent of Congress to involve the United States in war in Nicaragua.

No, Mr. President, there is nothing at all in the suggestion the Senator from Ohio has made about the speech I delivered in the House in 1914. I want to repeat now, in the time of my good friend, the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that I am going to ask the Senate to remain in session to-morrow and discuss this Nicaraguan question, and to have a session Saturday for the purpose of acting on my resolution which requests the President to withdraw our armed forces from Nicaragua. I ask unanimous consent that we may have a session of the Senate to-morrow and Saturday for the purpose of discussing and taking action upon my resolution providing for the immediate withdrawal of our soldiers from Nicaragua.

Mr. JONES. The Senator probably is not aware of the fact that the Senate has already entered into a unanimous consent agreement that when we adjourn to-day, we will adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am sorry that has been done; it must have happened when most of us were at lunch, and there were but few Senators here.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no, Mr. President; it happened immediately after the convening of the Senate to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Alabama ought to make a statement of that nature without being sure of his facts. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] at the beginning of the session this morning asked unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Monday. He stated reasons for making the request, and I, in the open session of the Senate, with rather a large attendance, said that I had no objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not know that, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES. The request was made right after the call of the roll, when a quorum was present.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not know that. I happened to be called out of the Chamber temporarily. I regret that I was not present. There is no Senator in this body who has a better record for attendance here than I have. I do not mean to boast about that; it is my duty to be here. But I was unfortunately out when this thing happened. But that does not change the seriousness of the situation. It will not affect the other purposes for which we did adjourn to come back in session to-morrow and discuss the Nicaraguan question. I wish it could be done. I ask it in the names of the boys who are yet living, who may have to die in a useless and cruel war in Nicaragua, and in the names of those dead boys who have been sacrificed to the outrageous, unholy purposes that I have mentioned.

#### AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am going to detain the Senate for only a few minutes.

I see the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in the Chamber, and I am wondering if I can not interrupt his silence, and ask him to state when he expects to have a farm relief bill reported out from his committee?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, answering the inquiry of the able Senator from Tennessee, I think the committee is in a position to take up consideration of that important subject matter about the 1st of February. I hope to pass it some time between the middle of February and the 1st of March, and have it promptly signed by the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has recently introduced in the Senate what is now known everywhere as the famous McNary-Haugen farm relief bill. It is substantially the same bill that Congress passed at the last session, but which the President vetoed. I trust that the Committee on Agriculture will, at the earliest possible moment, report that very excellent measure favorably.



The sooner the better. I regret that it is to be put off until February.

Mr. President, the President recently reported that 70 per cent of the population of America were exceedingly prosperous. He admitted that the other 30 per cent, the farmers of the country, were not in a prosperous condition. Surely, under circumstances like that, it is necessary for the Congress to do something for the benefit of so large a part of our population. I trust that the committee, therefore, will report as soon as possible this bill, and report it favorably. I think it would be well to report it without change.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the control and disposition of the surpluses of agricultural products so as to prevent such surpluses from controlling the prices of all the crops. It also has for its purpose to prevent undue and excessive fluctuations in the markets for such commodities, to minimize waste and speculation, and to further the organization of the producers of such products into cooperative associations. The bill sets up the governmental machinery to carry these various purposes into effect. That it is a workable, feasible, practicable, and constitutional measure I have not the slightest doubt.

Mr. President, the average condition of the average farmer in this country since 1920 has, indeed, been deplorable. This particular season, it is true, prices of farm products have been even measurably adequate. During all this time the prices of nearly everything the farmer had to buy have been continuously and steadily rising. The cost of their labor, of their farming implements, of their transportation, and of their taxes has constantly increased. For the most part their farms, their homes, their stock and cattle, and even their growing crops are mortgaged. This condition is known to everyone. Newspapers publish it. Farmers' magazines aver it. Bankers and business men admit it. Farmers' organizations state it. All politicians and statesmen agree to it. Even President Coolidge declares it and deploras it.

President Coolidge in recent addresses has dwelt upon what he calls the prosperity of this country. He went so far as to say that the only problem is whether this country desires continued prosperity.

Mr. President, it is true that the prosperity of certain classes of our people exists. The net earnings of General Motors, Standard Oil, and United States Steel, for instance, have exceeded anything in the history of industry. The railroads and other transportation companies are more prosperous than they have ever been. The banks are in a better condition than they have ever been before. Public utilities are prosperous. Those who labor in industrial plants, in banks, or for transportation and utility companies are, no doubt, by reason of Federal laws, drawing the biggest wages in their history. So, if President Coolidge had limited his remarks to these businesses favored by Federal laws and to those who work for them, his views as to our prosperous condition would be correct. However, he did admit a fact which is apparent to every individual person in this country—that the farmers were not included in this prosperity.

The farmers comprise 30 per cent of our population, and they are in the worst plight of their history, and any prosperity that does not affect 30 per cent of our people is not a real prosperity and can not last. Inasmuch as agriculture is the basis of the greater portion of our wealth, unless agriculture is in a prosperous condition, it is just a question of time when all must suffer. Prosperity for all classes except the farmers is like a marriage celebration without the bridegroom—a very unsatisfactory and hopeless business.

Mr. President, the energies of our people may be divided into five classes—capital (banking), industry, transportation, labor, and farming. The first four divisions comprise 70 per cent of our population and the last one, agriculture, 30 per cent. The Federal Government has legislated its most beneficent bounties on the first three, namely, capital (banking), industry, and transportation. In the Wilson administration it included labor in the favored classes, and very properly so. But, substantially speaking, the Federal Government has not yet done anything for the farmers.

The entire wealth of this country was estimated by the Federal Trade Commission in 1922 to be three hundred and fifty-three billions of dollars. The farm wealth for that year was estimated to be sixty-three billions of dollars.

That commission later estimated the entire income of this country to be approximately ninety billions. Of this amount, those engaged in agriculture only receive twelve billions, or 12½ per cent of the total.

In other words, 30 per cent of our population—the farmers—have only about 17 per cent of the national wealth and

only 12½ per cent of the national income. According to Government statistics which I have recently examined, it has been found that the average income of the average farmer in America, including all that he uses from the farm, is the pitiful sum of \$730 a year, while the average income for all groups engaged in occupations other than farming is \$1,445, just \$45 less than double the income of the farmers. When you take away from the income what he uses from his own farm, his cash income is but a little more than \$313.

Some assert that this lack of prosperity of the farmer is due to laziness, inefficiency, and lack of attention to his business. An eastern industrialist said to me a while back: "The farmers do not need any legislation. Just as soon as they quit riding around in automobiles and get down to business they will be all right. What they need is more alarm clocks and fewer automobiles." Incidentally, this man, who spoke of farmers riding in automobiles, owned three cars himself. He, of course, did not know what he was talking about. The enormous surplus crops that the farmer produces disproves the statement. It is his very energy, efficiency, and attention to his business that causes the surplus crops. If he were lazier and less efficient, he would produce no surplus, and, accordingly, get higher prices for his products.

I was reared on the farm. I know that in no occupation does a man work harder, longer, under a greater strain to his physical system, or under such trying conditions as does the farmer. He works in all kinds of weather and more hours than those engaged in any other occupation.

That the farmers' troubles are due to Federal legislation favoring all other classes, to whom the farmers must pay tribute, I now propose to show.

Mr. President, we have passed banking laws which provide for an adequate return to those engaged in the banking business and to all those who invest in public-service corporations and for all those who have money to lend. To these, by various Federal laws, we virtually guarantee a reasonable income.

Next, we have built up a protective tariff wall, the highest in history, for those engaged in industry. While this tariff was originally intended to bring revenue for the Government, that purpose is now but incidental. The real purpose of the tariff is to shut out competition with foreign-made goods and to enable those engaged in industry to impose a tax upon the consuming public. It has been estimated that the tariff enables industry to increase its income probably three billions of dollars annually. This tax which industry is permitted to levy upon the rest of the country is paid quite largely by the farmers. It might well be gradually eradicated.

Under the Esch-Cummins law and recent Supreme Court decisions the railroads and other public utilities have been guaranteed not only a fair, but a generous return upon their investments, and even sometimes where they have not made investments.

Under our income tax laws most corporations simply add their taxes to the cost of their productions and the public, which includes the farmers, pay these taxes.

Then through the creation of monopolies and by trade agreements often secretly made without regard to the Sherman antitrust law, industry virtually fixes its own prices and, of course, these prices are always made as high as traffic will bear; and the farmer has to bear his portion of this burden.

These special benefits and grants have all been made by Congress to the favored 70 per cent of our population and have made them very prosperous, while they have impoverished the farmers.

Indeed, not only does the farmer have no beneficial part in this legislation, but he has to pay substantially one-third of these benefits going to other favored classes.

In other words, under present conditions the farmer has to buy everything that he has to buy in a protected market, or in a stabilized market, or in a market in which prices are fixed by agreement, and sell everything he has to sell in the open markets of the world. He is caught coming and going. Speaking generally, he is the only producer in the world who has nothing whatsoever to do in fixing the price of the thing he produces. When any member of the favored classes has anything to sell the purchaser must pay his price. When the farmer has anything to sell he must take what is offered by the purchaser.

So, Mr. President, with all this favoritism to industry and to transportation and to capital and all this unfairness to agriculture, is it any wonder that to-day we find big business fairly rolling in wealth and paying enormous dividends and, on the other hand, we find the farmers in debt and impoverished, their rent and taxes tremendously high, their livestock and farming implements, their farms and their homes mort-

gaged, and in many cases being foreclosed and sold at public outcry?

When an industrial organization finds that its surplus will be too large it closes down a factory, and the result is that there is no surplus. The farmer can not do that. When he starts a crop growing nature alone can stop it, and, if there appears to be a surplus, it falls back on him and destroys him financially. Surely under these circumstances the Government ought to step in and prevent the surplus from controlling the price of the whole crop.

Some of my Democratic friends say that they are opposed to this bill because of the Jeffersonian doctrine of "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." They say that if we were to pass this bill it would be a special privilege to the farmers and, therefore, contrary to that doctrine. They lose sight of the first part of the slogan, "Equal rights to all." It is apparent from what I have heretofore said that it does not violate that doctrine. In this bill we give no special privileges to the farmer. All we do is to put the farmer on the same economic basis with the other 70 per cent of our population. It is directly in accord with the teachings of Mr. Jefferson. All we do is to give him "equal rights." Not only that, but it is in direct accord with the express provision contained in the last Democratic platform.

To my Democratic friends I say that if there had never been any special privileges granted to other classes, then I admit that the Government ought not to give a special benefit to the farmers, but, inasmuch as the Government has already granted privileges to the 70 per cent, as above set out, I contend that it is in exact line with the Jeffersonian doctrine to grant the same equal rights to the farmers that we have already granted to the other 70 per cent, so as to put all classes of our people on an equality.

Again, some say that we ought to repeal the tariff laws, the transportation laws, the banking laws, and the immigration laws.

Mr. President, we all know that we are not going to do that. When we Democrats get into power, we do not repeal the tariff laws. We simply reduce them on certain articles and apparently there is no intention on the part of anyone to do away with the tariff laws. Nor is it likely that we will repeal the banking laws, or the immigration laws, or any other laws conferring favors upon the favored 70 per cent. Under these circumstances, what is our manifest duty?

Why, Mr. President, the only way that we can carry out the doctrine of Mr. Jefferson is to put the farmer on the same economic basis with the other 70 per cent of our population that are now deriving special benefits from the Government.

Again, it is objected that the bill will not work. Let me give you an illustration of how it will work.

Suppose the McNary-Haugen bill had been in effect in 1926 when the enormous cotton crop, amounting to nearly 20,000,000 bales, was produced. Suppose the commission dealing with cotton under that bill had, after an examination into every fact, found that the average cost of producing cotton that year was 12 cents a pound, that a reasonable profit to the farmer was 3 cents a pound, and that the commission, acting under the bill, had given notice that if cotton went below 15 cents the commission would buy the surplus crop and take it off the market to be sold when cotton went above that price.

Remembering our experience with wheat in 1920 when Congress fixed a minimum price of \$1.50 a bushel, which was never reached, and when the Government did not have to buy any wheat, my judgment is that, if the commission had had to buy even 5,000,000 bales surplus last year, still there would have been no loss this year, because cotton went above 15 cents. So, in the cited case, instead of losing, there would have been a substantial gain for the farmers and the Government, and the farmers would have received a reasonable price for their cotton last year and would thus have avoided a bankrupt condition. It would have meant the difference between prosperity and the lack of prosperity in the cotton-producing business. We all know that there has never been a surplus of cotton carried over a period of three years in our history.

What could have been done for cotton could be done in the case of all staple agricultural products.

Again, it is objected that if the farmers are allowed to stabilize the price of their products, it will cause an increase production. This does not at all follow. The fear of an equalization tax will prevent any abnormal production; but even without this tax there need not be any fear.

The Government subsidizes the steel industry and there is not an overproduction of steel.

The Government through tariff laws and other laws subsidizes the shoe industry, but there is no overproduction of shoes. The copper industry, the iron industry, the public-utilities in-

dustry, and practically every industry are subsidized, and yet there is no overproduction. The price of transportation is absolutely fixed, and instead of there being more railroads the building of railroads has almost ceased.

Again, it is claimed that this bill involves price fixing. And so it does. But we have price fixing in every other industry, so why not permit the farmer to have something to do with fixing his prices?

Of course, no lawyer who ever read the Head Money Cases decided by our Supreme Court believes the bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. President, there is no question of greater importance in this country than the equitable distribution of wealth and income. It is so regarded by the foremost economists from Adam Smith on down. There can be no such thing as prosperity when wealth and income become centralized in one small group or groups of our population. It was claimed by the experts a few years ago that one-tenth of our population owned 90 per cent of the wealth. And this must be substantially true. It is not a good condition. It is a dangerous condition. When the wealth of Rome became centralized in a few landowners, with the rest of the nation serfs and slaves, without property and with scant incomes, Rome fell. When the king, nobility, and priesthood of France, comprising less than a million people, owned three-fifths of the entire land, leaving only two-fifths for the peasantry, comprising 25,000,000 people, we had the French Revolution. And the revolution in Russia was due to the same fundamental cause—the impoverishment of the masses. We must not permit our national wealth to be centralized to so great an extent. We must be fair and just to all classes of our people. If we confer rights upon one class, we must confer them equally upon all classes of our population. If we confer benefits upon one class of our people, we must confer them equally upon all classes of our population. It is the rankest kind of class legislation to confer untold benefits upon 70 per cent of our population and to deny equal benefits to the other 30 per cent, and especially when the other 30 per cent of our population are engaged in the most fundamental of all industries, namely, the production of food and clothing from the ground. We must not legislate in favor of one class at the expense of another.

Under the present conditions the farmer catches the rough end of the equation both ways. He is taxed enormously for the benefit of the other 70 per cent of our population. And when he sells his products he is often forced to sell at less than the cost of production, so that he can not make a living wage. The farmer, being the producer of those things which sustain life, should have the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. President, we want no serfs of any kind, nature, or description in this country. We want every man to be an up-standing citizen, entitled to equal rights and equal benefits under the law. This is what we seek for the farmers of this country. This is what this bill proposes to do. This bill may not be perfect. It may not give the farmer all to which he is entitled. It may not put him on equality with other industries. But it is a step in the right direction.

Agriculture is our basic industry. There are three things without which modern life can not exist—food, clothing, and shelter. Two of these—food and clothing—are produced by the farmer. That this is an important service, none can deny. That it is the most important, many will affirm. If the farmers should suddenly stop work and go on a strike, even for one short season, the wheels of industry would admittedly cease to turn, business of all kinds would stop, and famine, earth's greatest scourge, would stalk across the earth, casting its sinister shadows from coast to coast and carrying death and destruction in its wake, and humanity would perish. Such, my friends, is the great importance of the work done by farmers. Simple justice demands that those performing that work should not be put at a disadvantage by law.

As it is, they are very poorly compensated. The very least we can do is to place them on the same footing, so far as legislation can do it, with the other four economic groups. That is the purpose and object of this bill. I believe it will accomplish that purpose, and so believing, I shall vote for this bill again, as I have voted for it before, earnestly hoping that it will be enacted into law at this session of Congress.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him? I want to ask the Senator a question just at this point.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator attribute the adversity of the farmer at the present time entirely to the existence of the exportable surpluses of various crops?



Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that it has more to do with it than any other one factor.

Mr. BRUCE. What are the other causes entering into his adversity?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is the principal one.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator think that is the only one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. As I said, everything he buys he has to buy in a protected market and everything he sells he has to sell in the open markets of the world, and that, together with the surplus, constitutes the principal reasons for his present condition.

Mr. BRUCE. But the Republican Party has undertaken to protect him by imposing tariff duties on importations of agricultural products.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it has; but while it has tried to protect him by taking the tariff off of those things that he uses it has left the tariff on all those things which compose the things that he uses. I do not believe in a high tariff.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but he shares those other tariff burdens on his hat and his clothes, and the like, with the rest of us, does he not? We all pay the penalty in that kind of tariff burden.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but he shares it to a greater extent than others.

Mr. BRUCE. But how? I thought there were certain exemptions made in the tariff in favor of the farmer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; there are—for instance, farm implements—but all of the things which compose the farm implements, with which they are manufactured, are taxed, and in that way the farmer has to bear the tariff burden just as before.

Mr. BRUCE. But those duties, of course, are also applicable to other members of the community.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; they are not. They do not fall on 70 per cent of the people, because they do not use them.

Mr. BRUCE. But import duties do fall on other commodities which are used by the other elements of the community as well as the farmer. Conditions are equalized in that respect. May not these exportable surpluses be brought to an end in a perfectly natural way by economic influences which are at work at the present time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not, for the reason that we have been trying it for seven years, and their condition, with the exception of a little spurt in their favor this year, has been constantly getting worse and worse. The Senator knows that the great majority of the farms of the country to-day are mortgaged, and many of them mortgaged for more than they are worth. The Senator knows that the great lending companies—the insurance companies and other companies in the country lending money on farms—have had to take in at forced sale many of those farms. What is the Senator's idea about what we are going to do when those farms are all bought in at public sale by the companies which have loaned money on them? How are we going to manage our farming business except through them?

Mr. BRUCE. I think the World War brought about a period of extraordinary inflation. The farmers, of course, naturally enough, were influenced by the enhanced prices for agricultural products which they obtained at that time to enlarge their operations, and even to buy more land than they could pay for; and on the strength of the same inflation a vast number of small-scale banks sprang up throughout the country which went to the wall, as might have been expected, as soon as the inevitable period of deflation set in. Then, again, many persons totally ignorant of farming went to farming and helped still further to swell the inflation, so now, as I see it, the farmer is simply suffering from the consequences that always accompany a period of deflation. But the situation is improving; the trend of prices is upward; large numbers of farmers are leaving the city and going to the country, and are there sharing those generous wages which the inhabitants of industrial cities have been receiving.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary.

Mr. BRUCE. The situation is taking care of itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. The truth is that all of us know that constantly the farmers have received no benefits from the Federal Government while these other classes have constantly received benefits from the Government; the industrial classes through high tariff laws, the banking classes through law, the transportation companies through law, all for their benefit. That has given tremendous impetus to all other business and largely at the expense of the farmer. That is what is the matter with the farmer to-day. It is not because of his acts; it is not because of his default; it is not because of his shortcomings; but it is be-

cause of Federal legislation. The special benefits from the Government which are now being enjoyed by other classes should be passed to the farmers if they are to have a fair deal.

Even the Senator from Maryland himself admits that the farmers are not prosperous to-day; the whole country knows it is so. Why is it not the duty of the Congress of the United States under those circumstances to look into these matters and to equalize the rates?

#### AFFAIRS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a few moments ago the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] delivered an attack on the administration and on the conduct of affairs in Nicaragua which it seems to me ought not to pass without a brief answer at this time because it was based on false assumptions and on an incorrect grasp of the situation.

At the present time in Nicaragua our relations with the Conservative Party and with the Liberal Party, the two great parties which have fought for a hundred years for the control of Nicaragua, are so friendly, the administration's conduct of our affairs there has been so ably carried on, and our presence there is welcomed by so many people of both parties that it seems to me most unfortunate that any remarks should be made on this floor showing such a total lack of appreciation of what is actually going on. Such remarks may lead to trouble and to a misunderstanding of our position by our neighbors in Latin America.

It was stated by the Senator from Alabama that he thinks our actions are leading to criticism and ill will in Latin America. Certainly his remarks are inclined to promote just that state of affairs. At some future time I should like to go more fully into what has happened between the United States and Nicaragua since Congress adjourned in March, 1927, but at the present time I only desire to state briefly just what is happening there to-day and to refer to the relations between General Sandino and the Liberal Party and the activities which have just taken place which have called forth this torrent of criticism and several very unfortunate resolutions embodying a number of extremely inaccurate "whereases." These resolutions have been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and will undoubtedly there be carefully examined.

The rainy season in Nicaragua begins in June or July. During the next six months of the year it is almost impossible for anyone to carry on a military campaign. As Senators know, there are two distinct parts of Nicaragua, the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific seaboard, and there is very little connection between the two.

On the Pacific seaboard there is a great plain where there is much agriculture, where there are several cities, and where the capital is located. On the eastern seaboard there are mountains and valleys covered with forests where there are no wagon roads and no railroads, but only trails which are barely passable to pack animals in the dry season and practically impassable in the wet season. The rains generally end some time in December, when the country begins to dry up and some of the people then usually go back to their favorite occupation of carrying on political manifestations with bullets instead of ballots. As a matter of fact, at the present time practically all of Nicaragua is in a state of peace with the exception of a small area in the northern part near the boundary of Honduras, in a coffee-growing section, which during a large part of the year is practically inaccessible.

Last April, at the request of the President, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War and at the present time Governor General of the Philippines, went to Nicaragua to find out the exact state of affairs, to interview the leaders on both sides, and to see whether some working arrangement might not be brought about whereby we could secure that great desideratum of popular government, namely, a fair and open election. It is generally conceded that in the 100 years of Nicaragua's history there has scarcely ever been a fair election. It was extremely to be desired that at the next election every one who wished to do so should be given an opportunity to vote.

The people of Nicaragua are divided into two bitter political factions, the Conservatives and the Liberals. They do not differ very much in principle, as their names would seem to indicate. Those names apply rather to two geographical divisions. The people in one city being "conservative" and in another being "liberal." They have carried their animosity to such an extent that it is practically impossible, or, at any rate, extremely uncomfortable, and has been for many years, for any Conservative to attempt to do business in a Liberal city or for any Liberal to do business in a Conservative city. It reminds one of the situation in the Middle Ages when the independent cities of Italy were so divided by political parties and

carried on such bitter warfare as to make it impossible for the members of one political party to live with the adherents of the opposite political party. It will be seen that Mr. Stimson faced an extremely difficult mission.

It is not necessary at this time to go into the history of how President Diaz became president or why we recognized him, instead of recognizing President Chamorro at one time, or various other people. Mr. Diaz was in power at the time of Mr. Stimson's visit in April. General Moncada, the ablest general in Nicaragua, a Liberal and the active fighting head of the Liberal Party, had a considerable number of troops and a good many generals under his command and was threatening the Conservative section of Nicaragua. After having interviewed many people on both sides of the question, Mr. Stimson succeeded in securing an interview with General Moncada himself, and explained to him the attitude of this Government, which was merely the attitude of friendliness, of a desire to have fair elections carried on, a desire held by both Liberals and Conservatives alike. After several interviews an arrangement was arrived at with Mr. Stimson whereby General Moncada and the generals under him, with the single exception of the young General Sandino, agreed to bring in their arms, to stop fighting, and to accept the good offices of the United States and the word of the United States that it would see to it that the next election to be held in 1928 would be a fair election and that every Nicaraguan could go to the polls and cast his ballot without fear or favor. The Liberals heartily agreed to this, because the Conservatives were in possession of the larger part of the country, and, according to the history of Nicaragua, it would have been impossible for the Liberals to have voted freely unless some such arrangement had been made. Consequently General Moncada persuaded all his generals, with one exception, to accept Mr. Stimson's service.

Then followed an extraordinary series of events. President Diaz, the Conservative, abolished the censorship of the press and permitted General Moncada to publish his statements in the press, a privilege which had been denied him for a long time. He also agreed that the supreme court, which had been altered in an illegal manner during the time when General Chamorro was President—and it will be remembered that we did not recognize General Chamorro as President—should be reconstituted, and, furthermore, by an extremely generous act, President Diaz agreed to accept Mr. Stimson's suggestion that the six or seven Provinces of Nicaragua where the Liberals live and which are Liberal in sentiment and by heredity should be governed by Liberals instead of having Conservative governors who could only rule by force of arms and would always be making trouble.

In the course of the next few weeks President Diaz carried out his promises. Six of General Moncada's Liberal generals were placed in charge of these six Liberal Provinces. Freedom of the press was declared; the supreme court was reorganized; every effort was made to give a fair deal to both sides; and as a matter of fact the great majority of the Liberal Party in Nicaragua to-day, instead of being dissatisfied, as the Senator from Alabama assumes, with the attitude of the United States Government and the present condition of things, welcomes it, and looks forward complacently and eagerly to the next election, when its members will have an opportunity to vote and have their votes counted just as much as the Conservatives.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true, as the Senator has just stated, that the arrangement made with Mr. Stimson was satisfactory to Diaz and the Conservatives and to a very large majority of the Liberals, and that there are only a few left who are dissatisfied with the Government, why is it necessary for the Government of the United States to maintain its marines down there? If there are only a few people left on one side, and practically all the people are on the other side, why can they not maintain their own Government without our assistance?

Mr. BINGHAM. For the same reason that, although the great majority of people in the city of Washington desire to live in a peaceable and law-abiding manner, it is necessary to maintain several hundred police on the streets.

Mr. KING. But we do not import them.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but, according to the Senator's own statement, the Diaz régime, combined with the Liberal régime, have all these policemen and have all the country except a

little bit of a spot, and all the people are with them. They are in the great majority, and here are just a few insignificant fellows; and yet this big majority, with all the offices, with all the arms, with all the weapons, with all the territory, insist that the Government of the United States shall bring its marines down there to keep that big majority in office and keep it from being hurt by these few fellows who are out in the hills and do not have anything.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I think the Senator was not present when I attempted to review the bitterness between the two political parties. The Senator, coming from the State that he does, and having lived in a country that has for a hundred years accepted the decisions of the ballot box and whose political parties, though they have had certain bitter fights, have never entered into anything like the bitterness of those countries, is, if he will pardon me for saying so, unable to appreciate the bitterness of these factions and of the strife which would break out if we withdrew our marines.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him there again?

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to finish my brief statement; I yield to the Senator, however.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, it seems to me, is rather going back on his own statement. His statement is that after Stimson was there everything was lovely, and, as he said—I think using his own words—the great majority of the Liberals were satisfied.

Mr. BINGHAM. They were satisfied with our occupation, not with the Conservatives; and if we were to withdraw our marines they would immediately proceed to that civil war which has been the curse of Nicaragua for nearly a hundred years.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, it appears that there must have been perhaps a majority that was dissatisfied.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not with our occupation.

Mr. NORRIS. If the great majority was satisfied, I can not understand why it is necessary for us to send our marines down there to supervise an election and keep order. When practically the entire country is in control of the other two factions combined, when they are all agreeable and lovely and satisfied, why should we mix in?

Mr. BINGHAM. But they are not, Mr. President. They are not "lovely and agreeable and satisfied" with each other. They are satisfied with the attitude of our Government and have asked the United States to maintain its forces there in order that they may not cut each other's throats and in order that they may have a peaceable election.

Mr. NORRIS. Then we are in this condition—that the Conservatives, represented by Diaz, the government that we put in power, the government that we made—

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will not make a speech in my time.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; I will try not to. It is a little difficult, when I have the example of the wonderful speech the Senator is making, not to try to follow his leadership; but when everything is in control now of Diaz and Moncada, who are both united in the same proposition—

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not say they were united.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President; the Senator misunderstood me. I said that they had both asked the United States to have its marines stay there to see that they had a fair election.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; let us put it that way. We have this condition of affairs, then: Diaz, representing the Conservatives; Moncada, representing the great majority of the Liberals, united that we shall stay there and supervise their election.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what they have asked.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what they have asked. Let us take that as a foundation to start with—

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, this sounds to me very like the beginning of a new speech, and I desire to get through my remarks in a very few minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it is not going to be a speech. I am going to ask a question. Just take the statement that the Senator has made. These two factions have united, and they say to us, "Now, we are all united. We want a fair election, but we want you to keep your Army down here to see that we get it." Why should we not say, "If you are all agreeable, and there is nobody but Sandino and a few bandits over here in the hills, it does not make any difference whether they vote or not; attend to your own elections, and let the marines go home?"

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is my question.



Mr. BINGHAM. I am endeavoring to answer that by the speech which I am trying to make.

General Moncada, the leader of the Liberals, and the ablest general down there, who had been carrying on the war on behalf of Mr. Sacasa, who was on the Atlantic shore, was completely satisfied with the proposals made by Mr. Stimson, agreed to them, and endeavored to get all his generals to agree to them; and they all at one time did agree. General Moncada himself has made a statement in regard to the Sandino incident. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to this young bandit, who, in his early twenties, is enjoying the rôle of fighting up and down the little valleys in the north central part of Nicaragua, ravishing the coffee plantations, stealing the coffee of the planters, taking it across the boundary to sell it at low prices to the merchants of Honduras, and thereby getting money with which to carry on his depredations. He was once with General Moncada. Mr. Stimson, in a volume entitled "American Policy in Nicaragua," says:

In contrast with the sensational statements of some of our own press, the following public statement issued by General Moncada after the affair at Ocotal fairly describes the Sandino incident:

Existing on money from both natives and foreigners and merchants at Jinotega, as he had done before under threats of pillage and bloody reprisal, he—Sandino—interned in the mountains, took foreigners in the army and dedicated his time to murdering his enemies, both Conservatives and Liberals. He proved extremely cruel to prisoners, to whom life was never pardoned. I will not approve such a kind of war. I will never accept it. \* \* \*

In order to defend the cities of Jinotega, Estel, and Ocotal, the American command sent marines and soldiers of the Nicaraguan National Guard. Eighty-seven men of these mixed forces existed at Ocotal when it was attacked by Sandino and an overwhelming force. Sandino threw himself against them with all his army. The defenders resisted heroically for 16 hours. \* \* \*

Sandino suffered great losses, exceeding 400 men. This, of course, has not been murder. There was an armed conflict in a legitimate defense. We Liberals are greatly sorry for the death of our brothers, but it is our duty to deny all contact with mercenaries, censuring such a war lacking in ideals. In Nicaragua the Liberals greatly desire peace and are confident of the word of the President of the United States given to us through his personal representative, Mr. Stimson. All the other Liberal chiefs except Sandino complied with their duty.

There, Mr. President, we have a statement from the active head of the Liberal Party, and one of the ablest liberals in Nicaragua, stating exactly the position of this bandit Sandino. Sandino has been elevated by a few misinformed people who are more desirous of making trouble for the United States than peace for Nicaragua, into being a great national hero struggling against the Conservative Party. As a matter of fact, Sandino is a bandit, an outlaw from his own party, who has been unfaithful to the word which he gave his leader, General Moncada. Because it is more profitably to do so, he has withdrawn into the fastnesses of northern Nicaragua and there attempted to carry out the usual work of banditry. It has been necessary for the Nicaraguan constabulary—a recently organized group of police, trained at the request of the Nicaraguans by the Marine Corps—to go into the mountains and attempt to stamp out this banditry and this nest from which trouble is coming. The larger part of the troops involved are the constabulary of Nicaragua, this newly organized body which we are attempting to train so as to guarantee a fair election at the polls. A few of them, their teachers, have been the marines.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Assuming that all the Senator has said is absolutely within the facts—and I take it he knows something about the situation—what justification arises in the Senator's mind for our Government to go into the country of another government and interfere in its internal affairs in the way the Senator has pointed out? Is it the Senator's idea that it is one of the duties and powers of the American Government to send its troops all around the world to any nation that may happen to have internal dissensions and undertake to settle those dissensions in that other country?

I should like to have the Senator say what is his justification for our country going down and interfering in the internal affairs of Nicaragua.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question as to whether I should like to have the United States go into all parts of the world to maintain peace, my answer is "no." On the other hand, we have certain very definite inter-

ests in the Caribbean Sea, to wit, the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal is a vital feature of our national defense. We spent over \$400,000,000 in digging the Panama Canal as a defense measure. We are deeply interested in maintaining that part of our national defense.

The countries near the Panama Canal have a peculiar interest to us in connection with our isthmian policy, or that part of the Monroe doctrine which we must maintain for our own safety and for our own defense. We can not permit European countries to go in and establish themselves in these Caribbean countries, which would threaten the Panama Canal and our connections there. When revolutions arise, when it becomes impossible to protect life and property, it is the custom of all nations to intervene by sending their marines—which is not an act of war, but is an act recognized under international law—to see to it that their nationals are protected.

This kind of operation has in the past sometimes led to permanent occupation, not by the United States but by other countries. I may say in passing that in regard to Nicaragua we have received complaints from three or four European countries stating that if we did not go down there they would have to go there themselves. To aid the Nicaraguans to peace becomes a part of our national defense, a part of our isthmian policy, a part of our maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. We must either "put up or shut up." We have either to get out and let the other countries go in and protect their nationals or we have to do it ourselves. It seems to me that is part of our duty, and so long as it is done as wisely and patiently as this administration has carried it out, as the last administration carried it out, as the administration before that, the Democratic administration, carried it out in various Caribbean countries, it seems to me it has been well done.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am very much interested in what the Senator has said about the protection of the Panama Canal, and I am reminded of something to which I want to call his attention, when he speaks about the necessity of our protecting that canal, and says that is the one reason why we should intercede in Nicaragua to supervise their elections. The Senator probably noticed in one of the morning papers, as I did, that some fellow down in Panama, right in sight of the Panama Canal, has written and implored the Secretary of State, Mr. Kellogg, to send marines to Panama to supervise the election that is going to take place there. Should we do that?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a question for the President to decide.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, it is a little embarrassing, probably, for the Senator to take a position on that until he knows what the administration is going to do about it. But if the Senator—

Mr. BINGHAM. That is a very sage remark, Mr. President, but whether he likes or not the Constitution of the United States gives to the President the duty of recognizing the countries which are to be recognized, and does not give that duty to the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. But the Senator has taken a position justifying our action in Nicaragua, and given as a reason that we want to protect the Panama Canal. If we are going to supervise an election away up in Nicaragua in order to protect the Panama Canal, how much more reasonable is it that we should supervise an election right down there in the vicinity of the canal, and why should we not, if that is our policy, supervise the election, and what excuse can we give to the country and to the world for the answer of our Secretary of State, who has answered that request by stating that we decline to go into Panama to supervise their election?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator probably is sufficiently familiar with the history of Panama to realize that there is no such bitter animosity between the parties in the Republic of Panama as there is in the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. NORRIS. Who is going to decide how much bitterness there must be between political parties before we intercede?

Mr. BINGHAM. Very fortunately, the Constitution does not say that that question must be decided by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the President have that to decide? If he does, I want to call the attention of the Senator and, through him, of the President and the Secretary of State to the fact that there is some very bitter feeling in Ireland; that there is terrible strife in Ireland, and the excitement is extremely bitter. They fight over there, too. They have their shillies all trained, and they are ready, and why should we not go to Ireland and supervise their election?

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will tell us, before he gets through, how far Ireland is from the Panama Canal.

Mr. NORRIS. It is just a little bit farther than Nicaragua, and Nicaragua is a great deal farther than Panama. Are you going to stop at Panama? Why should we not protect the Panama Canal even in Ireland as well as in Nicaragua?

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator does not consider Ireland to be one of the Caribbean countries.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not said so.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator implied that.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have not said so.

#### AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] is very wrong if he thinks that I am not in sympathy with the farmer. There is every reason why I should be in sympathy with him. To begin with, I am the son of a farmer, a man whose exclusive occupation was that of a farmer for some 50 years of his life, and I myself have been engaged to no limited extent in the business of farming. There is no one in this country who exceeds me in the measure of respect and admiration that I feel for the farmer in many respects.

I think that the farmer is the backbone of all that is best in our American life. Mr. Jefferson said years ago that he is the most virtuous and patriotic member of American society. I share that view. In my opinion, a greater misfortune could not possibly befall this country than for the position of the farmer to remain one of permanent and irremediable distress. There can be no lasting prosperity for anybody unless he is prosperous, and with my conservative nature, that does not lend itself readily to extremist or radical views of any sort, how could I have any but the strongest feeling of political fellowship in every respect with him? No matter what revolutionary shocks this country may be called upon to endure, I believe we shall always be able to survive them, and mainly because of the conservatism, the strength of character, and the sterling qualities of the American farmer.

However, it is not true that nothing has been done for the farmer. In point of fact, Congress is quicker to respond to his demands than to those of any other individual who is a part of our body politic. The best friend I could have in the world is some one who could tell me at this time just what really can be done by human agencies, by legislative authority, to improve the condition of the farmer.

I have read practically every leading publication that has issued from the press in relation to the farmer since I have been a Member of this body. I have been in correspondence with members of granges and farmers' associations. I have purchased supplies for my table from a farmers' cooperative marketing association. I am eager to the very last degree to have pointed out to me some practical means by which the present adverse condition of the farmer may be bettered.

As I have said, it is not true that nothing has been done by Congress for the farmer. Much has been done since I have been here. Has the Senator from Tennessee forgotten that only a year or so ago, through the operation of the Hoch-Smith Act, we placed the Interstate Commerce Commission in a position deliberately to discriminate as regards railroad rates in favor of the farmer?

Mr. WHEELER. They have not done it, though.

Mr. BRUCE. They should do it.

Mr. McKellar. But they have not.

Mr. BRUCE. They have not?

Mr. McKellar. No.

Mr. BRUCE. Then go to the White House and ask the President, the next time he makes an appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission, to appoint some one who will help to carry out the letter and the spirit of that law.

Mr. McKellar. But the President has already expressed his views about it.

Mr. BRUCE. Then change your President.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of us would like to do that.

Mr. BRUCE. As a Democrat I hope we shall, though I say this with great respect to the present incumbent, for whom I have a high degree of regard in not a few particulars.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that wheat in Canada was bringing approximately 21 cents more just across the American border than it was in the United States, at a point just a few miles away, and that was notwithstanding the fact that we had a tariff of something like 30 cents.

Mr. BRUCE. Forty cents.

Mr. McKellar. Forty-two cents.

Mr. BRUCE. Forty-two cents, to be exact.

Mr. WHEELER. The increase was partly due to the fact that the Canadian railroads give a cheaper rate to the wheat farmers of Canada than to the American farmers.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I cite that to the Senator for the purpose of showing him—

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to have that called to my attention. That is but an administrative shortcoming which ought to be readily corrigible.

Mr. WHEELER. It ought to be.

Mr. BRUCE. It ought to be.

Mr. WHEELER. But just as long as the present administration is in power, it never will be.

Mr. BRUCE. That may be. All I have to say is that I never in my life united more cheerfully in the passage of any legislation than I did in the passage of the Hoch-Smith measure. I said to myself "Here at last is something workable. Here at last is something that will really benefit the farmer without doing injury to the rest of the community." I cast my vote for that measure. Mind you, at the same time I was conscious of the fact that, after all, the adversity of the farmer was by no means referable exclusively to high transportation rates, because only a short time before, notwithstanding all that had been said in Congress about the bearing of oppressive railroad rates on the farmer, Mr. Daniel Willard, the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, had gone on the stand before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and testified that if all the net profits that the railroads of his country had derived from the transportation of agricultural produce the year before were divided up between the wheat and corn growers alone of this country the division would signify an increase of only 4 cents a bushel to them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The figures that were given to me in Montana by some of the millmen who understand the situation show that the differential amounts to 10 cents on wheat as between the American farmer and Canadian farmer due to railroad rates.

Mr. BRUCE. If that is correct, I will gladly at any time go with the Senator from Montana to the Interstate Commerce Commission and ask them to redress, through the agency of the Hoch-Smith law, any inequality that exists between the situation of the farmer in this country and that of the Canadian farmer, if it can be redressed.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I happen to have the figures before me, as I have had occasion to look them up. The cost of carrying wheat from Saskatchewan to the lakehead is 26 cents a bushel. The cost of carrying it from Montana to the lakehead is 44 cents.

Mr. BRUCE. I suppose one reason is that the Canadian railroads, or some of them, are run by the Canadian Government, which to a certain degree conducts them without regard to pecuniary deficits. In other words, Government railways in Canada probably carry the wheat of the Canadian farmer at a loss—that is my surmise about it—and they do that deliberately as a matter of sound public policy.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator can readily understand that the American farmers living in the Northwest can not possibly compete with the Canadian farmers when that situation exists.

Mr. BRUCE. That is true. I am with the Senator from Montana; I am with the farmer, as I always am when any sound appeal is made on this floor to my support. I have given a striking illustration of what, through the Hoch-Smith measure, Congress is disposed to do for the farmer.

What else has it done since I have been here? Was it not only last year that with my approval Congress appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 to arrest the progress of the corn borer? Was it not only last year that Congress with my approval took the very extreme step—I think any Member of the Senate will say it was an extreme step—of appropriating a large sum of money for the purpose of supplying the farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the Northwest with seed? That was a measure that almost trenchanted upon the province of purely socialistic legislation; yet Congress was prepared to enact it.

Mr. WHEELER. We did the same thing with the railroads. After the war we deliberately took out of the Treasury of the United States and gave to the railroads large sums of money.

Mr. BRUCE. But we did not do that out of love for the railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not so sure about that.



Mr. BRUCE. We did it out of considerations affecting the welfare of the public generally, including the farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator at all that we did it for the benefit of the farmer. I do not agree that we took any money out of the Treasury of the United States and gave it to the railroads for the benefit of the farmers, for the fact remains that it never did the farmer one single bit of good. The railroads have never reduced rates to the farmer in the slightest degree since that time.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator knows that through the splendid management of our railroad systems, in spite of the harm done to them by Government administration during the World War, railroad rates have been inflated to a less degree than almost anything else in the whole economic field in this country. When general costs of living had gone up some 75 per cent, railroad rates had gone up only some 52 per cent. There could not be a finer illustration of the high degree of economy and efficiency with which the railroads of this country are operated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I think the statement of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] needs a little modification. I remember that the Esch-Cummins bill had provisions which did not meet my approval, and consequently I voted against it. I believed, however, that the Government should make a just settlement with the railroad companies. From what I heard I believed that the payments made to some companies were improvident. During the period the railroads were in the possession of the United States, after being taken over during the war, they suffered some damage and deterioration. Perhaps that is not true of all the railroads. It was proper that the Government should reimburse the railroads for any damages which had been occasioned to them by the Government. We took private property during the war, but compensated the owners for the losses which they sustained.

When we took over the railroad properties the same obligation rested upon the Government to compensate the owners for any injuries or damages to the same. I repeat, that by the operation of the railroads by the Government during the war and for some period thereafter, undoubtedly there was physical injury to some properties, and what we sought to do was to compensate the railroads for the damages which the carriers had sustained by the action of the Government.

Senators will also remember that the financial requirements of the Government were such that it embargoed the money market, so that railroad companies were unable to borrow money required to keep their railroad systems in proper shape. That was an injury to the railroad companies. It was inevitable of course by reason of the war; but all that we sought to do by congressional legislation was to put the railroads as nearly as we could in the same condition they would have been in except for the intervention of the Government. It was not the purpose of Congress to give to the railroads a single dollar, but only to make them whole for any losses sustained by reason of the action of the Government in taking over the railroads. If the settlement was improvident and the railroad companies received greater consideration than was due them, I think it was a mistake in judgment of those intrusted with the responsibility of making the settlements. I never understood that the Government intended that the railroads should receive any gratuity.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank the Senator most cordially for his timely and apposite interruption.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me again just a moment—

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I would say that I agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to this extent, that the railroads ought to have been paid for any damage done to them; but I submit that any fair-minded man who made a survey of the situation would have found that the Director General left many of the railroads in much better shape than they were in when they were taken over. I think the Congress of the United States took decidedly hasty action when it appropriated money to the railroads for some claims they made.

Mr. BRUCE. I think, as far as the region in which I live is concerned, that what the Senator said is certainly not correct. During the World War I happened to live on the Northern Central Railroad, which down to the time the Government took it over was one of the most splendidly managed properties in the country. The disorganization and demoralization which resulted from Government operation of that road was too lamentable for words. Finally it reached such a point that at times I saw what I had never before seen in the course of the 25 or

30 years that I had lived on it. I would see a train approach my station and be so inefficiently handled that when it stopped the last car in the train would be two or three hundred feet beyond the station platform.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know anything about the particular station at which the Senator lived.

Mr. BRUCE. I can not go further into that matter because it is a purely collateral one.

But after all, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] might have added, the real object of the Government in making those railroad appropriations was that of an ordinary tenant who before he leaves rented premises puts them in the original condition of repair in which they were when he took possession. The Government had the sense to know that until that great machine was refashioned, until the transportation service of the country was in as good a plight as it was when the Government took it over, all our material and economic interests of every kind, including our agricultural interests, would necessarily suffer, and therefore we spent that money.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again at that point?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the point I am making exactly. The United States Government went out during the war and urged every farmer in the United States to borrow more money to plant more wheat and to plant more wheat, until he went into debt clear over his head. Immediately afterwards the deflation came and the Federal reserve bank insisted that those loans be called. The result was that the farmers were deflated all over the country and went broke. The Government of the United States never came to their rescue, and said to them, "We are going to put you in the same position you were in before the war." They never have been put in that same position since the war, although the Government of the United States tried to put every other business in the country in the same position it was in previous to the war, except the farmer, and he has not been put there yet. The Congress of the United States has let him go on and go broke and suffer.

Mr. BRUCE. The inflation was so tremendous as regards land operations and land values throughout the country that the economic consequences could not possibly be taken care of by any ordinary administrative or legislative agency.

Mr. WHEELER. I will admit that it is a difficult thing, but the complaint the farmer makes is that the Government did that for the silver mines and the manganese mines and the railroads and innumerable other kinds of industry, but the poor devil of a farmer out on the farm has suffered because of the fact that he did not have the influence down at Washington that others seemed to have.

Mr. BRUCE. The silver mines have always gotten more out of the country than they have put back into it.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator about that, of course.

Mr. BRUCE. Especially when the Senator from Montana was addressing himself to the task of inducing Congress to adopt the ratio of 16 to 1 as respects silver and gold, which, too, at one time was supposed to be a panacea for all the misfortunes of the farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that was one time when the Senator from Maryland bolted the Democratic ticket.

Mr. BRUCE. That is the only time in my life when I did.

Mr. WHEELER. I did once; so we are even.

Mr. BRUCE. The thing in my political life of which I am proudest is that I refused to support Mr. Bryan when he was first a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, though I voted for every other Democratic candidate in my time from Winfield S. Hancock down, and even voted for Mr. Bryan twice after he abandoned his free-silver platform.

Then another thing the Senator should recollect is that even before I happened to be a Member of this body Congress was so liberal as to place the farmer entirely outside of the scope of the Sherman antitrust law. So in many respects—I might multiply my illustrations still more—Congress has been astute to put the farmer on a favored footing.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not think for one moment that the farmers of the country have ever been well enough organized to violate the Sherman antitrust law, does he?

Mr. BRUCE. The farmer has less disposition to violate the law than any other member of the American body politic. That is because, as Jefferson truly said, he is the most virtuous and patriotic individual in our country.

Among the complaints of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is the complaint that the farmer pays such high taxes. That complaint is not applicable to the Federal income

tax, because the farmer pays relatively only a small part of that tax. The Senator must have had in mind local taxes. Within whose political control, may I ask him, are such taxes in farming regions? Why, mainly, of course, the farmer. If taxes are higher than they should be in counties and other municipal subdivisions of rural communities, then the farmer should gird up his loins and bring them down, because he is in a better position, politically speaking, to do it than any other American citizen.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I am sure the Senator has in mind the fact that the farmer to-day pays probably twice or three times as much as before for everything he buys in the way of implements and everything he buys in the way of supplies, and he does pay, as has been stated here, probably three times as much in taxes, but he does not earn any more to-day than he ever did. The Senator is well aware of that.

Mr. BRUCE. His gross income is larger, but his net income is not.

Mr. COPELAND. No; his gross income is no larger. The price he gets to-day for his products is low, and his land is not capable of raising as much in the way of crops as it did 25 years ago.

Mr. BRUCE. If that is so, it is largely due to agricultural depletion, and after all the farmer must bear the brunt of responsibility for that.

But so far as the tariff is concerned the Senator is mistaken. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] will correct me if I am in error, but my impression is that under the present law there is no import duty on agricultural implements imported into this country.

Mr. COPELAND. I am well aware of that; but, nevertheless, because of the increased cost of manufacturing those implements, the cost to the farmer to-day is two or three times as much as it was 20 years ago; not because of the tariff in that instance.

Mr. BRUCE. But agricultural implements can be brought into this country free. There is no import duty, as I understand it, on agricultural implements.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, if we had free trade these agricultural implements would still be free, and there is nothing freer than free, and they are free now.

Mr. BRUCE. As the colored people used to suggest, there is such a thing as being "free until you are fool."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There are a great many commodities that are consumed that are highly taxed.

Mr. BRUCE. So far as general Government import taxes are concerned, the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is aware that all of us share those with the farmer. The farmer does not pay any more taxes on his boots or his shoes or his hat or any of the commodities that he uses along with myself than do I or does the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, without arguing now as to why it is so that these prices are high, the fact remains that we have an economic situation where the farmer must pay two or three times as much for everything he buys to-day as he did 20 years ago; and has, if anything, less income to-day than he then had.

Mr. BRUCE. The farmer has more gross income at the present time and less net income, because agricultural products are, of course, bringing higher prices absolutely than they have done for some time past.

Mr. COPELAND. They are not very much higher, I think.

Mr. BRUCE. But as to his net income, the profit made by him is not equal to that of the other members of the American community, because he can not make up on what he sells what he loses on what he buys. That is undoubtedly true, and it is in that that his hardship consists. Now, how is that hardship to be corrected? For God's sake, will not some Member of the Senate tell me how?

Mr. FRAZIER. By the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from North Dakota says by the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill, and he believes that to be so. He may be right and I may be wrong, but I can not see that at all.

In the first place, the Senator from Tennessee is mistaken when he brushes aside the constitutional objections to the McNary-Haugen bill in the cavalier way that he does, because the fact will be recalled that some four or five—I will not undertake to enumerate them all—of the very ablest lawyers in this body—the former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Lenroot, who is certainly a very able lawyer; the Senator from Mon-

tana [Mr. WALSH], who certainly answers that description, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who certainly answers that description, and others, all expressed the opinion when the McNary-Haugen bill was under discussion here at the last session of Congress that it was an unconstitutional measure; because the equalization fee provided for it was an unconstitutional, nugatory, and void thing. I—following, of course, at a long interval—do not hesitate for a moment to say that that is my opinion also as a lawyer.

Mr. WHEELER. But all of them voted for the child labor amendment, which was declared unconstitutional, too, did they not?

Mr. BRUCE. I did not do so.

Mr. WHEELER. But I say that all the gentlemen whom you have mentioned did so.

Mr. BRUCE. I feel that my democracy, to say nothing more, would have to carry an indelible reproach to the end of its existence if I had voted for the child labor amendment to the Federal Constitution. Nothing could possibly be plainer to my obscure vision than the fact that any law that attempts, as the McNary-Haugen bill does, to say to the farmer, willing or unwilling, "You shall pay an equalization fee out of every bushel of wheat or out of every bushel of corn or out of every unit of any sort that you sell" is unconstitutional and void. How could there be any difference of opinion on that point? Has the Federal Government, has any State government the power to say to me, assuming that I am a trader or a farmer, "When you sell something you must make a contribution to an equalization fund for the general benefit of your calling, whether you desire to do so or not"? That would be the very essence of arbitrary, tyrannical legislation, and it would violate every constitutional principle upon which the rights of the American citizen are founded. It would plainly be a taking of property without due process of law; it would plainly be an unconstitutional infringement on the private right of contract.

Mr. WHEELER. Congress took the saloon property, did it not, and took the breweries?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; and it was always held that the granting of the saloon privilege was a mere license; it was always held by the courts that it was revocable at any time.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Government has taken property in many other ways.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad it did take the saloon license away, antiprohibitionist as I am; but, of course, the Senator knows that what I have stated has been held over and over again by the courts.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator believe there is any legislative way by which the farmer may be helped?

Mr. BRUCE. That is what I was coming to. My constitutional objections to the McNary-Haugen bill as a lawyer are absolutely insuperable, and, then, I do not believe that it would produce the practical consequences which its sponsors think it would produce. I think, first of all, that it would give a tremendous stimulus—assuming that the equalization fee plan worked—to agricultural production. In other words, the act would result in very much the same kind of agricultural inflation that followed the economic consequences of the World War; and our last estate would be worse than our first.

Even if that could be overlooked, one of the very first consequences of the act, if it were workable, would be to make conditions of living to every man in the United States that much harder. Every one of us eats bread, for instance. Of course, the economic effect of the McNary-Haugen bill, if it proved workable, would be to make a loaf of bread dearer to every inhabitant of the United States than it was before.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Maryland will yield—

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the policy that the Senator from Maryland outlined awhile ago, that is, that the farmers should leave the farms and go to the industrial centers, would again raise the price of foodstuffs to the consumer.

Mr. BRUCE. I will come to that. That is a most timely suggestion, because I do not want to preach a gospel of despair, least of all in connection with the farmer.

Is there any sort of legislation that will answer the purposes? Well, I think an out and out subsidy would grant temporary relief. Of course, I am afraid that like every artificial stimulus the stimulus of the subsidy would lead to the headache and other bad consequences of "the next morning." For instance, I considered very carefully the debenture plan suggested by the grange which, of course, is a splendid association of farmers. That provides for nothing less than a subsidy; that is to say, for the receipt by the export farmer of a certain



percentage of import duties collected by the Government. That is unquestionably a subsidy pure and simple. And so as to every other suggestion that has been made here. They are in the nature, it seems to me, of mere subventions, mere subsidies, mere artificial governmental aids of one sort or other. So I can not see—I wish I could see—anything to fall back upon at all at the present time apart from some conservative forms of governmental assistance, except the working of natural economic laws; which laws are in operation. As I have said, there is the drift from the country to the city—but there is nothing so terrible about that, for the drift will be back to the country as soon as conditions there improve.

Mr. WHEELER. But the drift to the city will raise the price of wheat, the price of bread, which is the thing we are all talking about, and, of course—

Mr. BRUCE. I do not object to the price of bread being enhanced if it is enhanced through natural agencies and in a perfectly normal, natural, and legitimate manner.

Mr. WHEELER. But the claim is made against the McNary-Haugen bill by those who are opposing it that it is immediately going to raise the prices of all foodstuffs to the people. I wish to point out, however, that if the farmer does not get better prices and is to be compelled to leave the farm and to go into the industrial centers looking for work the effect will not only be to raise the price of foodstuffs but likewise to increase the bread lines which now exist in the city of Chicago.

Mr. BRUCE. The increase in the price of foodstuffs would keep pace with the increase in wages which the inhabitants of cities enjoy, and the people who moved from the farm to the city if they received the higher city wages would be in just that much better position to pay the farmer that they left behind good prices for his breadstuffs.

Mr. WHEELER. But the industries of the country to-day in many places are overcrowded, and there are bread lines in Chicago at the present time.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not know that the industries are overcrowded; and certainly we have no bread lines in the section of the country where I live.

Mr. WHEELER. I say there are bread lines in Chicago, and if the Senator does not think there are bread lines any place else let him go to New England.

Mr. BRUCE. Of course, there is going to be some unemployment; there is going to be some abatement in the extraordinary degree of industrial prosperity which we have enjoyed. Why is it? It is because the manufacturing industry of the country has caught up with the slack of the World War; that is all. When the World War came a vast amount of domestic constructive work had to fall into abeyance and had to be caught up by intensified industrial activity; but now industrial activity has caught it up and we have returned to normal conditions.

Mr. WHEELER. The present industrial condition is due also to the high tariff wall which we have built up around the Nation and which has restricted our world market.

Mr. BRUCE. At the same time that tariff wall is not so high that the volume of our import collections has not increased enormously. Inordinate as it may be pronounced by some of us to be, somehow the tariff has at least worked remarkably well in producing revenue for the country.

Mr. WHEELER. I think if the Senator will analyze the sources from which it is raised and how it is raised he may reach quite a different conclusion.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator is not more opposed than I am to inordinately high tariff duties. I wish the whole subject might be placed in the hands of some tariff commission, clothed with such a measure of dignity and occupying such a position of aloofness as to discharge some of the same useful functions that are discharged by the Interstate Commerce Commission; but the Senator from Montana, I know, would not like that standard of comparison at all.

So, Mr. President, I do not see anything to do except to wait.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. BRUCE. Just a moment and then I will yield to the Senator. Natural causes are at work correcting the agricultural situation. On the whole the trend of agricultural prices has been upward now for some years back; on the whole the farmer is getting more and more for his products, and, of course, that tendency is going to be stimulated all the time by this very influx of farmers from the country to the city which has been deprecated in some quarters, although I think unwisely deprecated. The whole theory of the sponsors of the McNary-Haugen bill is based on the idea that the present agricultural adversity is due to exportable surpluses; that is all; no other theory underlies that bill. What difference can it make to the farmer whether these exportable surpluses are

terminated by natural economic causes or by artificial legislation?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree entirely with the Senator's premise. I think it is for the purpose of curing the evil, not by trying to industrialize this Nation, but by trying to keep the farmers upon the farm and to give them a living wage; because I submit it is not only an economic problem but it is a moral problem as well which this country has got to face if we drive our farmers all into the industrial classes.

Mr. BRUCE. We can not drive them all into them; we will drive just enough to bring about an enhancement of the prices that the farmer receives for his products, which is the very object Senators have in view.

Mr. WHEELER. We will drive them to the cities and make industrialists out of them, and it is a difficult thing now to keep the farmers upon the farm, even when they are making money.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator knows that the greater our cities are and the more numerous their populations are the wider is the market for the farmer.

Mr. COPELAND. It works the other way also. Let me suggest another phase. If the farmer can not buy in the industrial sections, we are going to have trouble. The Senator and I come from great cities where there are great manufacturing plants, but, as we do not consume the things made there, there can be no prosperity in our cities unless there is prosperity on the farm. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that, taking manufactured steel, for instance, over half of the steel manufactured in the United States is used on the farm. It is amazing that over half of the steel manufactured in the United States goes into fence wire, plowshares, hammers, chains, and other things that are used on the farm.

Mr. BRUCE. And more than 30 per cent of the population of the country is on the farm.

Mr. COPELAND. More than half of the steel produced in the United States is used on the farm, and unless the farmer has buying power in the city we are going to have distress.

Now, if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I am advised by wise farmers that the actual cost of producing wheat to-day is \$1.75 a bushel, and yet they can not get more than \$1.25 for it. The other 50 cents is the labor put in by the farmer and his family without any return. I am not here to have any dispute with the Senator as to the remedy, but we must face the situation. Here is a disease. Here is this great farm industry going into bankruptcy. There must be found a way to cure it; and if no other way can be found, apparently the only measure before us that has in it any possible hope of relief is this particular measure.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not see any hope of relief in it at all. Every branch of human industry at times has to pass through a process of liquidation. When it is the steel industry, or some other great manufacturing industry, we do not think so much about it. It does not affect so many people, to begin with; but the industry passes through a period of liquidation, and that is followed by a period of reorganization and revival, and the industry starts off again on a new career of usefulness and success. I think that before very long, if we will just cease trying to apply artificial remedies to the agricultural situation, it will take care of itself. There will be some more hardship, even some more distress perhaps, but ultimately the situation will be permanently taken care of; whereas, assuming that the McNary-Haugen bill is workable, I can not see that any lasting results are likely to flow from the purely fictitious kind of relief for which it provides.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it seems to me that if we can not give protection to all we can not give protection to any. What I mean to say is, we have a tariff law protecting the manufacturer. We are contributing to him.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but we have endeavored to protect the farmer by the tariff. Some Members of the Senate seem to forget that we have a tariff on wheat. Have we not imposed a tariff on wheat, and have we not imposed a tariff on corn, and have we not imposed a tariff on potatoes?

Mr. KING. And on wool and on sheep.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; certain kinds of wool. Indeed we have. Tariff legislation has done all that tariff legislation possibly could do for the farmer.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will permit me, we know that the tariff on wheat has not been effective.

Mr. BRUCE. That is not the fault of Congress.

Mr. COPELAND. But let us go back to the general proposition of the tariff. By reason of it everything that the farmer

buys is increased in price. He is contributing to the manufacturer by reason of this enhanced price.

Mr. BRUCE. No more than I am or the Senator from New York is.

Mr. COPELAND. No; that is true; but, nevertheless, he is doing it. As a result of the existence of labor unions—and I am in favor of them—the price of labor has been fixed. The law of supply and demand does not operate. It is fixed.

Mr. BRUCE. Not altogether. You can not say that altogether.

Mr. COPELAND. The result is that the farmer's boy goes to the city, and when the farmer wants to hire a man he has to compete with high-priced labor. So the farmer is the victim of the labor union in fixing the price he has to pay for labor, the victim of the tariff system, the victim of the high freight rates; and if he is to contribute to these matters which have become fixed by reason of legislative action, is it not fair, if we can find some way of doing it, to give him the benefit of the same kind of legislative action?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but the difference is this: The farmer at the present time is the victim of natural economic causes to which the other elements of American society are not subject. That is what it comes to. In other words, when he goes out to sell his product he has to compete with the whole world. The wheat grower in Montana, for instance, has to compete with the Canadian wheat grower, and with the wheat grower in Hungary and in India and in Russia and in Argentine; in fact with the whole world; and, of course, while Congress is a pretty ambitious body, I take it for granted that it is not ambitious enough to endeavor to correct world-wide conditions which are beyond its power.

That is not true of anybody but the farmer. That is his crowning misfortune. Now, how are you going to make that good to him?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know that I know how to make it good to him. I am not sure that this bill would, but it is the only remedy that is offered; and it seems to me—and I say this in all kindness—that if the Senator has no remedy to offer he can not find fault with some of us if we take this one.

Mr. BRUCE. If the Senator will pardon me, it seems to me he puts himself in the position of a friend of mine a few years ago who came to me one day and said, "I am in trouble." I said, "What is your trouble?" He was a young man whom I had known for a great many years, a friend of mine, a man of standing. I said, "What is your trouble?" He scratched his head helplessly and said, "Why, I gave a friend of mine a check on a bank where I did not have any funds." I said, "What in the name of heaven did you do that for?" He said, "Because I had to give him something."

That is what the Senator proposes to give to the farmer. He says, "Take the McNary-Haugen bill, because nothing else is in sight." That is not a suggestive reason to my legislative conscience and intellect.

I have, however, said far more than I intended to say on this subject.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the Senator withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to move that the Senate vacate the order which was entered this morning to adjourn until Monday so that it can meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock for the purpose of discussing the Nicaraguan situation.

We can use that time to good advantage and accomplish something by remaining here to-morrow and Saturday and discussing this very important question. It is a question of great moment to the American people, and I believe that if Senators generally had known this morning that this adjournment course was contemplated this action would not have been taken. I was called out of the Chamber for a moment by some Alabama friends. If the request for adjournment had been made in my presence, I would have objected.

I want to move, therefore, that the Senate vacate that order and that we meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock for the purpose of discussing and making known to the country the facts about the Nicaraguan situation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the unanimous-consent agreement can not be vacated by a motion.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I ask unanimous consent that it be vacated.

Mr. WILLIS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 9, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5, 1928*

##### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath:

##### *To be chief boatswains*

Boatswain Albert M. Totzke.  
Boatswain John H. Kahnberg.  
Boatswain Frederick T. Ford.  
Boatswain Harvey S. Browne, jr.  
Boatswain Charles Martinson.  
Boatswain Otto Estad.  
Boatswain Simon B. Natwig.  
Boatswain Albert Nelson.  
Boatswain Hans Hanson.  
Boatswain Karl M. Varness.  
Boatswain Sverre Halvorsen.

##### *To be chief gunners*

Gunner William Woods.  
Gunner Charles Heinzel.  
Gunner Henry C. Sumner.  
Gunner Helge C. Hermann.  
Gunner Bertram G. Balcombe.  
Gunner Antone J. Sousa.

##### *To be chief machinists*

Machinist Louis Spaniol.  
Machinist Thomas G. Odderstol.  
Machinist Edward Derum.  
Machinist Alden E. Blood.  
Machinist Magnus J. Knudsen.  
Machinist Ross G. Blackburn.  
Machinist Frank J. Bennett.  
Machinist William W. DeWever.  
Machinist William F. Kilroy.

##### *To be chief carpenters*

Carpenter Thomas Abrahamson.  
Carpenter Walter Stegman.

##### *To be chief pay clerks*

Pay Clerk William O. Duker.  
Pay Clerk Raymond N. Gillis.  
Pay Clerk Harry F. Brodbeck.  
Pay Clerk Owen P. Thomas.  
Pay Clerk Thomas L. Ryan.  
Pay Clerk Albert Trachtenberg.  
Pay Clerk Louis Brezovic.  
Pay Clerk George D. Batey.  
Pay Clerk Jacob Rosenberg.

##### *To be chief radio electricians*

Radio Electrician Walter W. Reynolds.  
Radio Electrician William W. O'Steen.

The above-named officers have passed the physical and professional examinations required for the promotions for which they are recommended. This is in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1926.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Clifford M. Cox to be postmaster at Ozark, Ala., in place of J. A. Eason. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1927.

##### ALASKA

Stephen Birch to be postmaster at Kennecott, Alaska, in place of Stephen Birch. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Henry S. Sogn to be postmaster at Anchorage, Alaska, in place of H. S. Sogn. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.



## ARIZONA

J. Lee Conrad to be postmaster at Scottsdale, Ariz., in place of J. L. Conrad. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

## ARKANSAS

George E. Davis to be postmaster at Wynne, Ark., in place of G. E. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Charles E. Kemp to be postmaster at Trumann, Ark., in place of C. E. Kemp. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Abram J. Hansberry to be postmaster at Ozark, Ark., in place of A. J. Hansberry. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Jason O. Burns to be postmaster at Batesville, Ark., in place of J. O. Burns. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

## CALIFORNIA

Homer T. Riddle to be postmaster at Loyalton, Calif., in place of A. G. Sawin, resigned.

William J. Murray to be postmaster at Yucaipa, Calif., in place of W. J. Murray. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Marshall N. Johnson to be postmaster at Windsor, Calif., in place of M. N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ernest D. Gibson to be postmaster at Van Nuys, Calif., in place of E. D. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Henry F. Stahl to be postmaster at Vallejo, Calif., in place of H. F. Stahl. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Mary E. Rozier to be postmaster at Tuolumne, Calif., in place of M. E. Rozier. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Wade J. Williams to be postmaster at Tranquillity, Calif., in place of W. J. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ruby Vinten to be postmaster at Terminal Island, Calif., in place of Ruby Vinten. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Peder P. Hornsyld to be postmaster at Solvang, Calif., in place of P. P. Hornsyld. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Patrick C. Mulqueeney to be postmaster at Sawtelle, Calif., in place of P. C. Mulqueeney. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Algera M. Rumsey to be postmaster at Saugus, Calif., in place of A. M. Rumsey. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Grace E. Tooker to be postmaster at Santa Monica, Calif., in place of G. E. Tooker. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Terry E. Stephenson to be postmaster at Santa Ana, Calif., in place of T. E. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Pastor A. H. Arata to be postmaster at San Luis Obispo, Calif., in place of P. A. H. Arata. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ferris F. Kelly to be postmaster at San Juan Capistrano, Calif., in place of F. F. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Harrie C. Caldwell to be postmaster at San Fernando, Calif., in place of H. C. Caldwell. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

George G. Hughes to be postmaster at San Bruno, Calif., in place of G. G. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ellery M. Murray to be postmaster at St. Helena, Calif., in place of E. M. Murray. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

William Henson to be postmaster at Riverdale, Calif., in place of William Henson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Sula D. Abbott to be postmaster at Placentia, Calif., in place of S. D. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Frederick S. Lowden to be postmaster at Orland, Calif., in place of F. S. Lowden. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Presley E. Berger to be postmaster at Ontario, Calif., in place of P. E. Berger. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

George W. Archer to be postmaster at Norwalk, Calif., in place of G. W. Archer. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

John H. Tittle to be postmaster at Needles, Calif., in place of J. H. Tittle. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Charles G. Barnes to be postmaster at Morgan Hill, Calif., in place of C. G. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Fred F. Darcy to be postmaster at Montebello, Calif., in place of F. F. Darcy. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Fred Lewis to be postmaster at Mayfield, Calif., in place of Fred Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Edmund V. Wahlberg to be postmaster at Manhattan Beach, Calif., in place of E. V. Wahlberg. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Thomas P. Cosgrave to be postmaster at Madera, Calif., in place of T. P. Cosgrave. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Claude D. Richardson to be postmaster at McFarland, Calif., in place of C. D. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Raymond A. Rigor to be postmaster at McCloud, Calif., in place of R. A. Rigor. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ira B. Jones to be postmaster at Los Molinos, Calif., in place of I. B. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Charles F. Riedle to be postmaster at Los Banos, Calif., in place of C. F. Riedle. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Daniel McCloskey to be postmaster at Hollister, Calif., in place of Daniel McCloskey. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Corinne Dolcini to be postmaster at Guadalupe, Calif., in place of Corinne Dolcini. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Maude H. Parsons to be postmaster at Gerber, Calif., in place of M. H. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Lela P. Meday to be postmaster at El Segundo, Calif., in place of L. P. Meday. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

William P. Nye to be postmaster at Covina, Calif., in place of W. P. Nye. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Presentation M. Soto to be postmaster at Concord, Calif., in place of P. M. Soto. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Robert E. Thomas to be postmaster at Clovis, Calif., in place of R. E. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ruth E. Powell to be postmaster at Claremont, Calif., in place of R. E. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

James B. Fugate to be postmaster at Chino, Calif., in place of J. B. Fugate. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

George Cunningham to be postmaster at Boulder Creek, Calif., in place of George Cunningham. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Clifford M. Barnes to be postmaster at Big Creek, Calif., in place of C. M. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Theodore Rueger to be postmaster at Benicia, Calif., in place of Theodore Rueger. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Walter L. Haley to be postmaster at Associated, Calif., in place of W. L. Haley. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

John H. Hoeppel to be postmaster at Arcadia, Calif., in place of J. H. Hoeppel. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

James H. Whitaker to be postmaster at Anaheim, Calif., in place of J. H. Whitaker. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## COLORADO

Zella M. Hutchens to be postmaster at Seibert, Colo., in place of H. A. Simmons, removed.

Charles L. Rudel to be postmaster at Fleming, Colo., in place of C. L. Rudel. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

## CONNECTICUT

Allen C. Bennett to be postmaster at West Willington, Conn., in place of A. C. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Frederick W. Griffin to be postmaster at Cheshire, Conn., in place of F. W. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

William M. Mooney to be postmaster at Washington, D. C., in place of W. M. Mooney. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

## FLORIDA

Pearl Beeler to be postmaster at Nokomis, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Joseph P. Hall to be postmaster at Sanford, Fla., in place of J. P. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lydia E. Ware to be postmaster at St. Andrew, Fla., in place of L. E. Ware. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William E. Burch to be postmaster at Palmetto, Fla., in place of W. E. Burch. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lola Miller to be postmaster at Palm Beach, Fla., in place of Lola Miller. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel J. Yoder to be postmaster at Moore Haven, Fla., in place of S. J. Yoder. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Eugene D. Rosenberger to be postmaster at Micanopy, Fla., in place of E. D. Rosenberger. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ernest B. Wells to be postmaster at Lawtey, Fla., in place of E. B. Wells. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Elisha D. Wightman to be postmaster at Fruitland Park, Fla., in place of E. D. Wightman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Walter C. Gholson to be postmaster at Chattahoochee, Fla., in place of W. C. Gholson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

James L. Ambrose to be postmaster at Bunnell, Fla., in place of J. L. Ambrose. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Capers S. Weathersbee, jr., to be postmaster at Branford, Fla., in place of C. S. Weathersbee, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Gabriel I. Daurelle to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Fla., in place of G. I. Daurelle. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

## GEORGIA

Mrs. Hubert H. Berry to be postmaster at Sparta, Ga., in place of J. M. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1927.

J. Arthur Westbrook to be postmaster at Powder Springs, Ga., in place of E. D. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1927.

## HAWAII

Manuel J. Carvalho to be postmaster at Makaweli, Hawaii, in place of C. H. F. Spillner, resigned.

John I. Silva to be postmaster at Elele, Hawaii, in place of J. I. Silva. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## ILLINOIS

Elizabeth K. Welch to be postmaster at Lexington, Ill., in place of H. E. Flesher, removed.

Elmer C. Thorp to be postmaster at Winslow, Ill., in place of E. C. Thorp. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry J. Busefink to be postmaster at West Salem, Ill., in place of H. J. Busefink. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ralph K. Crawford to be postmaster at West Point, Ill., in place of R. K. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles E. McPheeters to be postmaster at Sullivan, Ill., in place of C. E. McPheeters. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Rollin A. Gouwens to be postmaster at South Holland, Ill., in place of R. A. Gouwens. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William J. Parsons to be postmaster at Silvis, Ill., in place of W. J. Parsons. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis H. Richards to be postmaster at Scales Mound, Ill., in place of L. H. Richards. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel M. Combs to be postmaster at Ridgway, Ill., in place of S. M. Combs. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ted Henderson to be postmaster at Ridge Farm, Ill., in place of Ted Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Homer H. Cravens to be postmaster at Plymouth, Ill., in place of H. H. Cravens. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Benjamin F. Bosley to be postmaster at Ransom, Ill., in place of B. F. Bosley. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles B. Switzer to be postmaster at Piper City, Ill., in place of C. B. Switzer. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis E. Selby to be postmaster at Pekin, Ill., in place of L. E. Selby. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lydia Drain to be postmaster at Oconee, Ill., in place of Lydia Drain. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Marion F. Stewart to be postmaster at Moweaqua, Ill., in place of M. F. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Clark D. Smith to be postmaster at Milan, Ill., in place of C. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George E. Whitmore to be postmaster at Mendota, Ill., in place of G. E. Whitmore. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Margaret T. Layne to be postmaster at Menard, Ill., in place of M. T. Layne. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Mayme F. Brooke to be postmaster at Matteson, Ill., in place of M. F. Brooke. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Daisy M. Uphaus to be postmaster at Macon, Ill., in place of D. M. Uphaus. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William T. Bedford to be postmaster at La Salle, Ill., in place of W. T. Bedford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William Sutton to be postmaster at Kempton, Ill., in place of William Sutton. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ina R. Stout to be postmaster at Hopedale, Ill., in place of I. R. Stout. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Adam P. Brown to be postmaster at Henry, Ill., in place of A. P. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Silas H. Rich to be postmaster at Gridley, Ill., in place of S. H. Rich. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Elmer L. Trowbridge to be postmaster at Green Valley, Ill., in place of E. L. Trowbridge. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John R. Hanlon to be postmaster at Grant Park, Ill., in place of J. R. Hanlon. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas M. Jones to be postmaster at Goreville, Ill., in place of T. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles O. Selfridge to be postmaster at Good Hope, Ill., in place of C. O. Selfridge. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Bennett F. Henderson to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ill., in place of B. F. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George J. Patterson to be postmaster at Genoa, Ill., in place of G. J. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Walter J. Ehrler to be postmaster at Galena, Ill., in place of W. J. Ehrler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George L. Spangler to be postmaster at Franklin Grove, Ill., in place of G. L. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Perry Westerfield to be postmaster at Frankfort Heights, Ill., in place of Perry Westerfield. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Glenn S. Wade to be postmaster at Farina, Ill., in place of G. S. Wade. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William E. Mickle to be postmaster at Emden, Ill., in place of W. E. Mickle. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Louis O. McKerrrow to be postmaster at Elmwood, Ill., in place of L. O. McKerrrow. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John E. Moyer to be postmaster at Dixon, Ill., in place of J. E. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William W. Taylor to be postmaster at Divernon, Ill., in place of W. W. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George A. Kraus to be postmaster at Danvers, Ill., in place of G. A. Kraus. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.



Carroll C. Porter to be postmaster at Dahlgren, Ill., in place of C. C. Porter. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred E. Flessner to be postmaster at Cullom, Ill., in place of F. E. Flessner. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Robert L. Endicott to be postmaster at Crossville, Ill., in place of R. L. Endicott. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Guy H. McKelvey to be postmaster at Coulterville, Ill., in place of G. H. McKelvey. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Herbert D. Short to be postmaster at Coffeen, Ill., in place of H. D. Short. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas F. Wharrie to be postmaster at Coal City, Ill., in place of T. F. Wharrie. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas R. Pearse to be postmaster at Chillicothe, Ill., in place of T. R. Pearse. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Cecil W. Bishop to be postmaster at Carterville, Ill., in place of C. W. Bishop. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Alice Jenkins to be postmaster at Carriers Mills, Ill., in place of Alice Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Della M. Green to be postmaster at Cambria, Ill., in place of D. M. Green. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Russell S. Brown to be postmaster at Brighton, Ill., in place of R. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis A. Roberts to be postmaster at Blandinsville, Ill., in place of L. A. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William Hughes to be postmaster at Bement, Ill., in place of William Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Raymond Phillips to be postmaster at Beecher City, Ill., in place of Raymond Phillips. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Gulford M. Humphrey to be postmaster at Beardstown, Ill., in place of G. W. Morton. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1926.

John H. Holthaus to be postmaster at Aviston, Ill., in place of J. H. Holthaus. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred W. Pitney to be postmaster at Augusta, Ill., in place of F. W. Pitney. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Frank Gain to be postmaster at Astoria, Ill., in place of Frank Gain. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Esther V. Wheeler to be postmaster at Ashmore, Ill., in place of E. V. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Hugh Martin to be postmaster at Argenta, Ill., in place of Hugh Martin. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis B. Tuthill to be postmaster at Anna, Ill., in place of L. B. Tuthill. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

#### INDIANA

Austin Palin to be postmaster at Wingate, Ind., in place of Austin Palin. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Edmund H. Imes to be postmaster at Westville, Ind., in place of E. H. Imes. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Edmond M. Wright to be postmaster at North Salem, Ind., in place of E. M. Wright. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Albert J. Baumgartner to be postmaster at Elkhart, Ind., in place of A. J. Baumgartner. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Harry M. Weliever to be postmaster at Darlington, Ind., in place of H. M. Weliever. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

Elizabeth Hatfield to be postmaster at Centerville, Ind., in place of Elizabeth Hatfield. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Hugh Horn to be postmaster at Bicknell, Ind., in place of Hugh Horn. Incumbent's commission expired January 3, 1928.

#### IOWA

Carl Wulkau to be postmaster at Williams, Iowa, in place of Carl Wulkau. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1927.

Gabriel Pederson to be postmaster at Waterville, Iowa, in place of Gabriel Pederson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Thomas A. Sanders to be postmaster at Malcom, Iowa, in place of M. A. Brewer. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

William Linnevold to be postmaster at Decorah, Iowa, in place of William Linnevold. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Sigvart T. Kittlesby to be postmaster at Calmar, Iowa, in place of S. T. Kittlesby. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

#### KANSAS

Frank A. Moore to be postmaster at Tribune, Kans., in place of F. A. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Patrick H. Lindley to be postmaster at Havana, Kans., in place of P. H. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Harry W. Adams to be postmaster at Elkhart, Kans., in place of H. W. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

#### LOUISIANA

Louis Hebert to be postmaster at White Castle, La., in place of Louis Hebert. Incumbent's commission expired January 15, 1927.

Walter B. Eisely to be postmaster at Tallulah, La., in place of W. B. Eisely. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Novilla T. King to be postmaster at Simsboro, La., in place of N. T. King. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William R. Morgan to be postmaster at Mandeville, La., in place of W. R. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lilha B. Brown to be postmaster at Lecompte, La., in place of L. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Edward F. Crawford to be postmaster at Gretna, La., in place of E. F. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George W. Varnado to be postmaster at Franklinton, La., in place of G. W. Varnado. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ralph N. Menetre to be postmaster at Covington, La., in place of R. N. Menetre. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Robert M. Johnson to be postmaster at Colfax, La., in place of R. M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

J. Rodney Murrel to be postmaster at Church Point, La., in place of J. R. Murrel. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas L. Ducrest to be postmaster at Broussard, La., in place of T. L. Ducrest. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

#### MAINE

Doris C. Sanborn to be postmaster at Dryden, Me., in place of A. E. Cram, resigned.

#### MARYLAND

Guy M. Coale to be postmaster at Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of G. M. Coale. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

James J. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Sandy Spring, Md., in place of J. J. Shoemaker. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Jessie P. Smith to be postmaster at Luke, Md., in place of J. P. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William Marshall to be postmaster at Lonaconing, Md., in place of William Marshall. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William J. Lyon to be postmaster at Hughesville, Md., in place of W. J. Lyon. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

James O. Wilson to be postmaster at Hebron, Md., in place of J. O. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Luther Bennett to be postmaster at Goldsboro, Md., in place of Luther Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Walter A. Aaronson to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Md., in place of W. A. Aaronson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Walter L. Tower to be postmaster at Dalton, Mass., in place of W. L. Tower. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## MICHIGAN

Russel W. Swhier to be postmaster at St. Clair Shores, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1928.

Murl H. DeFoe to be postmaster at Charlotte, Mich., in place of M. H. DeFoe. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## MINNESOTA

Lambert L. H. Osberg to be postmaster at Winthrop, Minn., in place of L. L. H. Osberg. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Julia H. Johnson to be postmaster at Windom, Minn., in place of J. H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Lewis B. Krook to be postmaster at New Ulm, Minn., in place of L. B. Krook. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

James H. Smullen to be postmaster at Lesueur Center, Minn., in place of J. H. Smullen. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

John Briffett to be postmaster at Lake Benton, Minn., in place of John Briffett. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Jennie M. Payne to be postmaster at Goodridge, Minn., in place of J. M. Payne. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## MISSOURI

William H. Tanner to be postmaster at Sikeston, Mo., in place of A. T. Winchester. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1927.

## MONTANA

Rose C. Spangler to be postmaster at Superior, Mont., in place of R. C. Spangler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

## NEBRASKA

Paul E. Watts to be postmaster at Unadilla, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Joseph H. Harrison to be postmaster at Ravenna, Nebr., in place of J. H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

John S. Myers to be postmaster at Grant, Nebr., in place of J. S. Myers. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Lewis A. Wight to be postmaster at Gibbon, Nebr., in place of L. A. Wight. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Fred H. Carlson to be postmaster at Alliance, Nebr., in place of F. H. Carlson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

## NEW JERSEY

Anna Heus to be postmaster at Demarest, N. J., in place of Emma Heus, to correct name.

Richard T. Beak to be postmaster at Shrewsbury, N. J., in place of R. T. Beak. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

John P. Adair to be postmaster at Highlands, N. J., in place of J. P. Adair. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## NEW YORK

Albert Lynd to be postmaster at Nassau, N. Y., in place of Alice Husted, deceased.

Wallace Moore to be postmaster at Madalin, N. Y., in place of J. T. Hoffman, removed.

Fred H. Van Doren to be postmaster at Lodi, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Waldron R. Hulst to be postmaster at Lagrangeville, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1926.

C. Irving Henderson to be postmaster at Worcester, N. Y., in place of C. I. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

M. Clifton Seaman to be postmaster at Woodmere, N. Y., in place of M. C. Seaman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Jennie C. Stanton to be postmaster at West Camp, N. Y., in place of J. C. Stanton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Julius H. Fisher to be postmaster at Wellsville, N. Y., in place of J. H. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George T. Anderson to be postmaster at Whitesboro, N. Y., in place of G. T. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Robert L. Putnam to be postmaster at Weedsport, N. Y., in place of R. L. Putnam. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ray W. McEwen to be postmaster at Waverly, N. Y., in place of R. W. McEwen. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Marion E. Wroten to be postmaster at Trudeau, N. Y., in place of M. E. Wroten. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Oliver Keator to be postmaster at Tillson, N. Y., in place of Oliver Keator. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William M. Ackerman to be postmaster at Sparkill, N. Y., in place of W. M. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Armon P. Gunnison to be postmaster at Sodus Point, N. Y., in place of A. P. Gunnison. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William A. Hilton to be postmaster at Skaneateles, N. Y., in place of W. A. Hilton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Helen M. Braisted to be postmaster at Silver Bay, N. Y., in place of H. M. Braisted. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William W. Bates to be postmaster at Sidney, N. Y., in place of W. W. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Frank A. Erickson to be postmaster at Sherman, N. Y., in place of F. A. Erickson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William H. Savage to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in place of W. H. Savage. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John D. Fratsher to be postmaster at Saugerties, N. Y., in place of J. D. Fratsher. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George H. Farley to be postmaster at Sag Harbor, N. Y., in place of G. H. Farley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Max C. Headley to be postmaster at Rushville, N. Y., in place of M. C. Headley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Bruce S. Preston to be postmaster at Roxbury, N. Y., in place of B. S. Preston. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Park J. Johnson to be postmaster at Ripley, N. Y., in place of P. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Mabel S. Griswold to be postmaster at Pottersville, N. Y., in place of M. S. Griswold. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Frank V. Palmer to be postmaster at Philmont, N. Y., in place of F. V. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John T. Mills to be postmaster at Oyster Bay, N. Y., in place of J. T. Mills. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

James Owens to be postmaster at Ossining, N. Y., in place of James Owens. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Carl R. Allen to be postmaster at Oriskany Falls, N. Y., in place of C. R. Allen. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles H. Brown to be postmaster at Orchard Park, N. Y., in place of C. H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Edith A. Parker to be postmaster at Moravia, N. Y., in place of E. A. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Perry R. Bennett to be postmaster at Milford, N. Y., in place of P. R. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ernest K. Smith to be postmaster at Middleburg, N. Y., in place of E. K. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Lizzie M. Tuthill to be postmaster at Mattituck, N. Y., in place of L. M. Tuthill. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles L. Stackpole to be postmaster at Lyon Mountain, N. Y., in place of C. L. Stackpole. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry Strube to be postmaster at Long Island City, N. Y., in place of Henry Strube. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.



Lizzie G. Hall to be postmaster at Little Valley, N. Y., in place of L. G. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Herbert L. Merritt to be postmaster at Katonah, N. Y., in place of H. L. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Joseph R. Cowell to be postmaster at Jordan, N. Y., in place of J. R. Cowell. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Skidmore Pettit, jr., to be postmaster at Jamaica, N. Y., in place of Skidmore Pettit, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Thomas J. Wintermute, jr., to be postmaster at Horseheads, N. Y., in place of T. J. Wintermute, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Frank W. Thornton to be postmaster at Holland, N. Y., in place of F. W. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Clara E. Tetterer to be postmaster at Hewlett, N. Y., in place of C. E. Tetterer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Claude H. Preston to be postmaster at Heuvelton, N. Y., in place of C. H. Preston. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Walter J. Pelham to be postmaster at Hensonville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Pelham. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ray F. Dunlop to be postmaster at Harrisville, N. Y., in place of R. F. Dunlop. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ella E. Rodger to be postmaster at Hammond, N. Y., in place of E. E. Rodger. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Will E. Roberts to be postmaster at Granville, N. Y., in place of W. E. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Paul W. Christenson to be postmaster at Gowanda, N. Y., in place of P. W. Christenson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Arthur Decker to be postmaster at Goshen, N. Y., in place of Arthur Decker. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Edward T. Cole to be postmaster at Garrison, N. Y., in place of E. T. Cole. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William A. Patterson to be postmaster at Gansevoort, N. Y., in place of W. A. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Walter A. Pierce to be postmaster at Fort Ann, N. Y., in place of W. A. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Philip F. Schaefer to be postmaster at Fleischmanns, N. Y., in place of P. F. Schaefer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Gaylord F. Carpenter to be postmaster at Elbridge, N. Y., in place of G. F. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George A. Matthews to be postmaster at Eden, N. Y., in place of G. A. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Raymond L. Hodge to be postmaster at East Syracuse, N. Y., in place of R. L. Hodge. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Rhoda Hoyt Lee to be postmaster at Dundee, N. Y., in place of R. H. Lee. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Mabel I. Alverson to be postmaster at Dexter, N. Y., in place of M. I. Alverson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George C. Palmer to be postmaster at Cuba, N. Y., in place of G. C. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Clarence L. Grippen to be postmaster at Corinth, N. Y., in place of C. L. Grippen. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Norman D. Higby to be postmaster at Constableville, N. Y., in place of N. D. Higby. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Carolyn F. Parker to be postmaster at Chestertown, N. Y., in place of C. F. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Margaret R. Mulligan to be postmaster at Central Islip, N. Y., in place of M. R. Mulligan. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles W. Brock to be postmaster at Cattaraugus, N. Y., in place of C. W. Brock. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Ernest K. Hudson to be postmaster at Castleton on Hudson, N. Y., in place of E. K. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Lawrence R. Ryckman to be postmaster at Brocton, N. Y., in place of L. R. Ryckman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George H. Farley to be postmaster at Broadalbin, N. Y., in place of G. H. Farley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Maud Rogers to be postmaster Bridgehampton, N. Y., in place of Maud Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Rudolph W. Schoverling to be postmaster at Bayville, N. Y., in place of R. W. Schoverling. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Clarence G. Jones to be postmaster at Barneveld, N. Y., in place of C. G. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Arthur L. Howard to be postmaster at Baldwinsville, N. Y., in place of A. L. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Howard E. Whealey to be postmaster at Baldwin, N. Y., in place of H. E. Whealey. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Joseph A. Douglas to be postmaster at Babylon, N. Y., in place of J. A. Douglas. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Annie J. McFadden to be postmaster at Ardsley, N. Y., in place of A. J. McFadden. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles N. Wood to be postmaster at Angola, N. Y., in place of C. N. Wood. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

Clarence B. Stinson to be postmaster at Warwick, N. Dak., in place of C. B. Stinson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Elizabeth J. Olson to be postmaster at Medina, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Olson. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Donald B. McDonald to be postmaster at Maxbass, N. Dak., in place of D. B. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Nellie E. Gagner to be postmaster at Lignite, N. Dak., in place of N. E. Gagner. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Ella C. Sweeney to be postmaster at Berthold, N. Dak., in place of E. C. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

#### OHIO

Milton W. Stout to be postmaster at West Liberty, Ohio, in place of M. W. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Russel A. Medaugh to be postmaster at Spencerville, Ohio, in place of R. A. Medaugh. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Alta N. Johnson to be postmaster at Rushsylvania, Ohio, in place of A. N. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

James E. Simpson, jr., to be postmaster at Racine, Ohio, in place of G. A. Circle. Incumbent's commission expired December 4, 1926.

Charles T. Cline to be postmaster at New Matamoras, Ohio, in place of C. T. Cline. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Fred O. Simpson to be postmaster at Belle Center, Ohio, in place of F. O. Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

#### OREGON

Charles R. Tyler to be postmaster at Yamhill, Oreg., in place of C. R. Tyler. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Josephine T. Stark to be postmaster at Sutherlin, Oreg., in place of J. T. Stark. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Lyle B. Chappell to be postmaster at North Bend, Oreg., in place of L. B. Chappell. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Amos E. Chick to be postmaster at Wehrum, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

Susanna S. Hartman to be postmaster at Yardley, Pa., in place of S. S. Hartman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Wayne Elliott to be postmaster at West Chester, Pa., in place of Wayne Elliott. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Charles F. Wenrich to be postmaster at Wernersville, Pa., in place of C. F. Wenrich. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Maurice F. O'Connell to be postmaster at Susquehanna, Pa., in place of M. F. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Thomas Y. Tarlton to be postmaster at Summithill, Pa., in place of T. Y. Tarlton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Peter L. Rohrer to be postmaster at Smoketown, Pa., in place of P. L. Rohrer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Richard L. Harpel to be postmaster at Sinking Spring, Pa., in place of R. L. Harpel. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Eberhard D. Smith to be postmaster at Sellersville, Pa., in place of E. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George B. Wilcox to be postmaster at Portland, Pa., in place of G. B. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Nora L. Pickering to be postmaster at Peckville, Pa., in place of N. L. Pickering. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Raymond A. Kistler to be postmaster at Palmerton, Pa., in place of R. A. Kistler. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel J. Matthews to be postmaster at Olyphant, Pa., in place of S. J. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Naomi G. Hazell to be postmaster at Norwood Station, Pa., in place of N. G. Hazell. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

David B. Seasholtz to be postmaster at North Wales, Pa., in place of D. B. Seasholtz. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Bert D. Stephens to be postmaster at Nicholson, Pa., in place of B. D. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William E. Marsden to be postmaster at Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of W. E. Marsden. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

William E. Henry to be postmaster at Nazareth, Pa., in place of W. E. Henry. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Phares S. Auxer to be postmaster at Mountville, Pa., in place of P. S. Auxer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John W. Clouse to be postmaster at Moscow, Pa., in place of J. W. Clouse. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John L. Eppley to be postmaster at Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of J. L. Eppley. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry B. Haines to be postmaster at Maytown, Pa., in place of H. B. Haines. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Claude W. Keiser to be postmaster at Lykens, Pa., in place of C. W. Keiser. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Henry M. Stauffer to be postmaster at Leola, Pa., in place of H. M. Stauffer. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Allen L. Shomo to be postmaster at Hamburg, Pa., in place of A. L. Shomo. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Irene M. Tiffany to be postmaster at Hallstead, Pa., in place of I. M. Tiffany. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Warren R. Grove to be postmaster at Greencastle, Pa., in place of W. R. Grove. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Edward E. Fricker to be postmaster at Glenside, Pa., in place of E. E. Fricker. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George W. Larkins to be postmaster at Ford City, Pa., in place of G. W. Larkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Oscar W. Welsh to be postmaster at Douglassville, Pa., in place of O. W. Welsh. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

J. Beaver Gearhart to be postmaster at Danville, Pa., in place of W. L. Gouger. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1927.

Harry M. Logan to be postmaster at Conshohocken, Pa., in place of H. M. Logan. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John K. Hagerty to be postmaster at Chester, Pa., in place of J. K. Hagerty. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

George H. Houck to be postmaster at Cairnbrook, Pa., in place of G. H. Houck. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Otis J. Pandel to be postmaster at Burnham, Pa., in place of O. J. Pandel. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Luther F. Gilbert to be postmaster at Boyertown, Pa., in place of L. F. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Stanley L. Bechtel to be postmaster at Bally, Pa., in place of S. L. Bechtel. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

John F. Schwarzauber to be postmaster at Archbald, Pa., in place of J. F. Schwarzauber. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

#### RHODE ISLAND

Frank A. Rixford to be postmaster at Woonsocket, R. I., in place of F. A. Rixford. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Edwin S. Babcock to be postmaster at Saunterstown, R. I., in place of E. S. Babcock. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Catherine M. Green to be postmaster at Portsmouth, R. I., in place of C. M. Green. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Thatcher T. Bowler to be postmaster at Newport, R. I., in place of T. T. Bowler. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Hartzell R. Birch to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I., in place of H. R. Birch. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

George T. Lund to be postmaster at Greystone, R. I., in place of G. T. Lund. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

George W. Warren to be postmaster at Bristol, R. I., in place of G. W. Warren. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Mary V. Nichols to be postmaster at Bradford, R. I., in place of M. V. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

Almira B. Lewis to be postmaster at Ashaway, R. I., in place of A. B. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

#### SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas J. Bolin to be postmaster at Neeses, S. C., in place of T. J. Bolin. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Fred L. Timmerman to be postmaster at Graniteville, S. C., in place of F. L. Timmerman. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Carl M. Norton to be postmaster at Estill, S. C., in place of C. M. Norton. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Samuel L. Myers to be postmaster at Chester, S. C., in place of S. L. Myers. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Dora C. Folk to be postmaster at Brunson, S. C., in place of D. C. Folk. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

Waula E. Westbrook to be postmaster at Blacksburg, S. C., in place of W. E. Westbrook. Incumbent's commission expires January 8, 1928.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

Guy M. King to be postmaster at Wessington, S. Dak., in place of G. M. King. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1927.

#### TENNESSEE

Harry K. Dodson to be postmaster at Kenton, Tenn., in place of H. K. Dodson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

John F. Gaines to be postmaster at Gainesboro, Tenn., in place of J. F. Gaines. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.



## TEXAS

Grover C. Stephens to be postmaster at Sierra Blanca, Tex., in place of G. C. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

James M. Cottle to be postmaster at Moran, Tex., in place of J. M. Cottle. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Andrew J. Harrison to be postmaster at Goldthwaite, Tex., in place of A. J. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

William N. Moore to be postmaster at Fort Worth, Tex., in place of W. N. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Vivian B. Boone to be postmaster at Fabens, Tex., in place of V. B. Boone. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Arno L. Wahrmond to be postmaster at Eagle Lake, Tex., in place of A. L. Wahrmond. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1927.

Henrietta Fricke to be postmaster at Brenham, Tex., in place of Henrietta Fricke. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

## VERMONT

Edward H. Willis to be postmaster at Pittsford, Vt., in place of E. H. Willis. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

Murray K. Paris to be postmaster at Lyndon, Vt., in place of M. K. Paris. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## WASHINGTON

James H. Adams to be postmaster at Waitsburg, Wash., in place of J. H. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Emmett V. Fleming to be postmaster at Springdale, Wash., in place of E. V. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Robert O. Logsdon to be postmaster at Sprague, Wash., in place of R. O. Logsdon. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Warren P. Cressy to be postmaster at South Bend, Wash., in place of W. P. Cressy. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles M. Perkins to be postmaster at Seattle, Wash., in place of C. M. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

James Lane to be postmaster at Roslyn, Wash., in place of James Lane. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred B. Goldsworthy to be postmaster at Rosalia, Wash., in place of F. B. Goldsworthy. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John W. Cowdery to be postmaster at Rainier, Wash., in place of J. W. Cowdery. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

George W. Edgerton to be postmaster at Puyallup, Wash., in place of G. W. Edgerton. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Hazel P. McVicker to be postmaster at Port Blakely, Wash., in place of H. P. McVicker. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles A. Fiedler to be postmaster at Newport, Wash., in place of C. A. Fiedler. Incumbent's commission expires January 10, 1928.

James C. Blevins to be postmaster at Naches, Wash., in place of J. C. Blevins. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Anna M. Robertson to be postmaster at Montesano, Wash., in place of A. M. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Andrew H. Byram to be postmaster at Millwood, Wash., in place of A. H. Byram. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Ernest R. Anderson to be postmaster at La Center, Wash., in place of E. R. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles C. Mulligan to be postmaster at Kirkland, Wash., in place of C. C. Mulligan. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Tillman E. Kamerer to be postmaster at Hanford, Wash., in place of T. E. Kamerer. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Herbert P. Fisher to be postmaster at Garfield, Wash., in place of H. P. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Henning E. Johnson to be postmaster at Du Pont, Wash., in place of H. E. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

William W. Woodward to be postmaster at Darrington, Wash., in place of W. W. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Will T. Howard to be postmaster at Coupeville, Wash., in place of W. T. Howard. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Arthur B. Cass to be postmaster at Connell, Wash., in place of A. B. Cass. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Julius C. Raaberg to be postmaster at Clarkston, Wash., in place of J. C. Raaberg. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Eliza F. Head to be postmaster at Cathlamet, Wash., in place of E. F. Head. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Allison C. Presson to be postmaster at Buena, Wash., in place of A. C. Presson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Mark Harris to be postmaster at Brush Prairie, Wash., in place of Mark Harris. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Fred H. Tonkin to be postmaster at Black Diamond, Wash., in place of F. H. Tonkin. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Charles P. Stapp to be postmaster at Anacortes, Wash., in place of C. P. Stapp. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Louis H. Gurnsey to be postmaster at Addy, Wash., in place of L. H. Gurnsey. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William G. Powell to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Wash., in place of W. G. Powell. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

## WEST VIRGINIA

George Kirchner to be postmaster at Everettville, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1927.

## WISCONSIN

Lewis H. Cook to be postmaster at Wausau, Wis., in place of L. H. Cook. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Henry J. La Grandeur to be postmaster at Somerset, Wis., in place of H. J. La Grandeur. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Walter F. Martin to be postmaster at Mukwonago, Wis., in place of W. F. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

William A. Devine to be postmaster at Madison, Wis., in place of W. A. Devine. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Theodore B. Ottum to be postmaster at McFarland, Wis., in place of T. B. Ottum. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Carl L. Christianson to be postmaster at Bloomer, Wis., in place of C. L. Christianson. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

Thomas A. Walby to be postmaster at Hudson, Wis., in place of T. A. Walby. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

John Meili to be postmaster at Alma, Wis., in place of John Meili. Incumbent's commission expires January 7, 1928.

## WYOMING

Henry C. Miller to be postmaster at Douglas, Wyo., in place of H. C. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1928.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 5, 1928*

## DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Thomas M. Wilson to be consul general and secretary.

## REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Vincent B. May to be register of land office, Las Cruces, N. Mex.

Frank P. Light to be register of land office, Lakeview, Oreg.

## POSTMASTERS

## GEORGIA

Bennie Leviton, Fargo.

Pet L. Cooke, Sparks.

## KENTUCKY

James W. Felkins, Albany.

Roy Fraim, Alva.

Ella Dabney, Coxton.

James H. Turner, Evarts.

Chris L. Tartar, Somerset.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Adin R. Chapman, Berlin.  
 Harry L. D. Severance, Claremont.  
 May F. Sumner, Goffstown.  
 Maurice H. Randall, Haverhill.  
 Jesse C. Parker, Hillsboro.  
 Harriet O. Harriman, Jackson.  
 Charles L. Bemis, Marlboro.  
 Arthur J. Gould, New London.  
 Harold B. Pinkham, Newmarket.  
 Stella E. Coburn, North Rochester.  
 Harry F. Smith, Peterboro.  
 George P. Furbush, Rochester.  
 Charles E. Winn, Somersworth.  
 Harvey E. Gates, Troy.

## NEW MEXICO

Frederic L. Sammis, Cimarron.  
 James R. Roberts, Elida.  
 Earl Douglass, Farmington.  
 Marie J. O'Bryan, Santa Fe.

## NORTH CAROLINA

John B. Lonon, Ashford.  
 John F. Barlow, Banners Elk.  
 Andrew J. DeHart, Bryson City.  
 George E. Sweet, Cornelius.  
 Alice W. Starr, Creswell.  
 James H. Darden, Faison.  
 John S. Downing, Fayetteville.  
 Nugent B. Hester, Fuquay Springs.  
 Andrew J. Runion, Hot Springs.  
 Marvin E. Barrett, Jackson.  
 Leah J. Franck, Jacksonville.  
 Robert W. Taylor, Lucama.  
 John A. Klein, Morehead City.  
 Flora E. Schlabach, Moyock.  
 Rosa J. Cooper, Nashville.  
 John H. Williams, Pikeville.  
 George W. Cox, Raeford.  
 Calvin L. Hill, Saluda.  
 Jacob H. Quinn, Shelby.  
 Robert H. Dixon, Siler City.  
 Sudie M. Morgan, Spindale.  
 Grace B. Fagg, Stoneville.  
 William P. King, Windsor.  
 Fronie Perry, Wingate.

## OHIO

Fred H. Tibbetts, Columbus.

## PENNSYLVANIA

William H. D. Moyer, White Haven.

## TENNESSEE

Bassil G. Taylor, Mason.

## VIRGINIA

G. Buford Bralley, Austinville.  
 Virgie C. Goode, Bassetts.  
 Ralph W. Teates, Bealeton.  
 Ella E. Ames, Belle Haven.  
 Charles R. Whitmore, Broadway.  
 William H. Haney, Claremont.  
 John R. Jones, Cleveland.  
 Charles W. Kilgore, Coeburn.  
 Gilmer T. Slusser, Fincastle.  
 Emmett L. Allen, Glenallen.  
 James O. Humphreys, Goshen.  
 Ernest M. Williams, Ivanhoe.  
 Caroline E. Bristow, Ivor.  
 Thomas L. Waters, Konnarock.  
 William E. Shaver, Maurertown.  
 Henry A. Storm, McLean.  
 Charles M. Saunders, Milford.  
 Harrison H. Dodge, Mount Vernon on the Potomac.  
 Frank M. Brown, National Soldiers Home.  
 Ruth O. Griffin, Newsoms.  
 Edward P. Schultz, Onancock.  
 Alice M. Welch, Phoebus.  
 Robert M. Bradshaw, Rice.  
 Walter E. Richmond, Rural Retreat.  
 Emmett W. Brittle, Wakefield.  
 Richard D. Holland, Windsor.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Hugh W. Cox, Morgantown.

## WISCONSIN

Albert C. Holmes, Evansville.  
 Edward C. Rehfeld, Horicon.  
 Lawrence W. Daniels, Kansasville.  
 Russell E. Burlingame, Statesan.  
 Ernest W. Mederith, Union Grove.  
 William A. Devine, Madison.

## WITHDRAWAL

*Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 5, 1928*

## POSTMASTER

## NEW MEXICO

Nemesina Sandoval to be postmaster at Bernalillo, in the State of New Mexico.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, January 5, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

All our times are in Thine hands, O God, and gratitude fills our hearts to-day! Give us the light of Thy truth; invigorate our understanding that we may have right discernment in the solution of all problems. Ours is a moral duty which no one can ignore and no individual can evade. May we stand forth on the golden roll of those of every age who have wrought righteousness, tamed wickedness, and contributed to the ethical assets of their day. In the volume of life's experience may we be inspired by the lessons of courage, of faith in God, of confidence in our institutions, and devotion to the principles of education and liberty. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment an act (H. R. 6657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River near Kettle Falls, Wash.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment an act (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to continue commissioners in the Court of Claims, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 1398. An act relating to pardons;

S. 1661. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the Okanogan project, in the State of Washington, to the Okanogan irrigation district upon payment of charges stated; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

## SWEARING IN A MEMBER

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas appeared before the Speaker's rostrum and took the oath of office.

## ACQUISITION OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia, to be used as sites for public buildings, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 483, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the bill by title.



The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 483) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain land within the District of Columbia, to be used as sites for public buildings.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have some explanation of this proposition. I reserve the right to object for the present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The amendment gives authority, when the title to this property down on the triangle is vested in the United States, for the demolition of the buildings on this property, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, with the consent of the Public Buildings Commission, to take such portion of the triangle as is not needed immediately for public buildings and plant trees in the area thus provided for, so that it may be cleaned up and made ready for the public buildings that are to be erected thereon.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ELLIOTT. With pleasure.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to say to the gentleman who has reserved his objection that it seems to me that this is not only a proper but a necessary amendment. There is a comprehensive scheme for the building of the structures contemplated in this triangle property. Some of the spaces are to be open and park spaces to provide for the proper approaches to the buildings. In order for some of those buildings in contemplation to be constructed it will be necessary to tear down some of these little buildings which will be purchased and where the ground is to be occupied by the new buildings.

Mr. SNELL. How much territory is included in this purchase?

Mr. LANHAM. This is to give that authority within the triangle which is being purchased for the Government buildings. All of this is subject to the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, which must look necessarily during the construction of these new buildings to temporary quarters for Government employees in the various branches of the public service. Consequently, the Public Buildings Commission would not attempt to raze any of the buildings which were necessary for the housing of Government employees during the time of the construction of the new buildings, and without the authority of this amendment we would have to be coming back for additional legislative authority to carry on the building projects that are contemplated.

Mr. SNELL. It is not the intention to raze all those buildings at once?

Mr. LANHAM. Surely not.

Mr. SNELL. It is a pretty sweeping proposition. I think we should have full information before we granted it.

Mr. LANHAM. If we gave it exclusively to one man, the authority would be pretty sweeping; but here it must be done with the approval of the Public Buildings Commission, which is the very commission which has within the scope of its authority the entire project. I think with that safeguard there can be no valid objection.

Mr. SNELL. What does that area include?

Mr. LANHAM. It includes that part of the territory and area lying between the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue and the north side of Maryland Avenue, extending to Fifteenth Street, which the Government does not now own. It is within this area that these new departmental buildings—that for the Department of Commerce, and that for the Department of Labor, and that for the Department of Justice, and the Archives Building, and so forth—are to be constructed according to the existing law. The Public Buildings Commission must give its approval; and the Public Buildings Commission, as the gentleman knows, has charge of the assignment of space for all of the departments and certainly will not permit the premature razing of any building which will be necessary for the temporary housing of employees of the Government until the whole project is completed.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, I am in sympathy with this general program, but this is such a sweeping amendment that I thought we ought to ask some questions and know it has been gone into thoroughly.

Mr. LANHAM. I think the gentleman is correct about that, but I think the saving clause with reference to the Public Buildings Commission would cover any objection that might be raised to the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I want to ask the gentleman a question. The amendment states

that these authorized contracts shall be charged against appropriations. That does not go far enough. This amendment should definitely state that all of these authorized contracts shall be within the limit of the appropriations.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is a matter which can be taken care of in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. It should be taken care of here, for when our Government executes a contract we are forced to stand by it. The Senate had to furnish some brains, at least, in adding something deemed necessary to this bill, but apparently it has not gone far enough. There ought to be something else added to this bill. There ought to be a proper limitation added, and I think the gentleman ought to ask that this Senate amendment be agreed to with an amendment, to wit, that all of these authorized contracts shall be within the limit of the appropriations. With such an amendment added to the Senate amendment, I should not object, but I shall object unless that amendment is added.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not think any amendment is necessary.

Mr. BLANTON. You could enter into contracts for several hundred million dollars right now with respect to this triangle. I am familiar with it because I have been investigating it for the last 10 years. Now is the time and place to place proper restrictions upon this legislation.

Mr. DENISON. If the gentleman will permit, this only authorizes contracts for destroying old buildings.

Mr. BLANTON. But they could contract to spend a lot of money to destroy old buildings.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman knows it would not take several hundred millions to destroy those old buildings, so why not be frank about it?

Mr. BLANTON. It should not take it. But this commission could contract to pay a whole lot of money to destroy them. I am in favor of destroying the ones that are necessary but we certainly ought to place a proper limitation in the bill before we agree to this amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT. They can not destroy any of them without the consent of the Public Buildings Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. But the commission could agree to something, just like commissions do agree with some things that are sometimes foolish.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Has the gentleman no confidence in the Public Buildings Commission?

Mr. BLANTON. I have confidence in it as far as it goes and my confidence in that commission goes as far as my confidence goes in any Government commission. Some man proposes something and then every other fellow votes aye without looking into it. We must place a proper limitation in this bill. Whenever you enter into a contract signed by a commission of this Government under act of Congress, the Congress is going to have to pay for it, and you know we will have to appropriate the money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object unless the amendment is modified as I have suggested.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 483 from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana modifies his request and now asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 483, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. I understand that this matter is subject to the approval of the Public Buildings Commission?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That there is to be some landscape gardening, and things of that sort, in connection with it? I can see that it is quite obvious that this should be done, but does this contemplate the approval of the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The whole plan is subject to the approval of the Fine Arts Commission and they have already approved this plan.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wished to be quite certain of that.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Fine Arts Commission has been acting in cooperation with the Public Buildings Commission in the matter of this triangle property?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. LANHAM. With respect to the suggestion made by my colleague from Texas, I will ask the gentleman if he does not

know as a member of the Public Buildings Commission that it is not the policy of that commission for somebody to make a motion and then every other member of the commission ignorantly vote aye?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. It is done on the House floor day after day. Some fellow gets up and makes a motion of this kind and then everybody votes aye.

Mr. LANHAM. It certainly is not done in this commission.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; not in the Public Buildings Commission. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees:

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, and Mr. LANHAM.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. GEORGE S. GRAHAM

The SPEAKER. Under the authority granted the Speaker by House Resolution 72, the Chair appoints the Hon. ROYAL H. WELLER to administer the oath of office to the Hon. GEORGE S. GRAHAM.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table on Saturday it shall be in order to take up the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] establishing a commission to make certain investigations in connection with the sinking of the *S-4* and of the Navy Department.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, that will be under the general rules of the House?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; it will be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE OATH OF OFFICE TO HON. FRANK H. FOSS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution of the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 78

Whereas FRANK H. FOSS, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, from the third district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Speaker, or a deputy named by him, be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said FRANK H. FOSS at his home in Fitchburg, Mass., and that the said oath when administered as herein authorized shall be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said FRANK H. FOSS.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I further request that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FOSS] be granted indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 21, 1927, they presented to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5800. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles:

On December 19, 1927:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of salaries to the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1927, on the 20th day of that month.

On December 22, 1927:

H. R. 5800. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

#### ENLARGEMENT OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. KIESS. Mr. Speaker, on December 21 last the Speaker laid before the House a letter from the Commission for the Enlargement of the Capitol Grounds, which was ordered to be printed as a document for the information of the Members. The report contains 15 illustrations which are not covered by the order of the House.

The law provides that no part of the appropriation made for printing and binding shall be used for printing any illustrations unless the order to print expressly authorizes the same.

I ask unanimous consent that the order to print may include these illustrations.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the gentleman. What document is this?

Mr. KIESS. It is the report of the commission composed of the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol on the question of the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds. Permission to print was granted, but permission was not granted to include the illustrations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### ADDRESS OF HON. A. B. HOUGHTON, AMBASSADOR TO ENGLAND

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech delivered by the Hon. Alanson B. Houghton, a former Member of this House and now ambassador to the Court of St. James, made at Harvard University in June last on the question of world peace.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what that has to do with the proceedings of the Congress.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it has anything to do with the proceedings of the Congress, but it has very much to do with the questions now before the Congress and before the world. I hope the gentleman will not object. I am confident I take very little time of this House and use very little space in the RECORD.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The author of this address is a former Member of the House.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes; a former Member of the House and now ambassador to Great Britain.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has not the important subject of "world peace" something to do with the proceedings of Congress, or are we not concerned with that at all?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I think the country is very much interested in it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress the Hon. James Mann and the Hon. Claude Kitchin and the Hon. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, stood steadfast in the protection of the RECORD, and for a long, long time during the service of the gentlemen mentioned they kept out of the RECORD by objection extraneous matter which did not record the proceedings of Congress. I am not the heir of their duties, but I have a great admiration for what they did and what they accomplished. No one else seems to have taken their work seriously, and the RECORD consequently has been filled every session with a lot of matter which has absolutely nothing to do with the proceedings of Congress. It makes the RECORD ridiculous.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Did the distinguished gentlemen to whom he alludes ever go so far as to object to the publication of an address of a distinguished diplomat in the Foreign Service of the American Government, such as the ambassador to Great Britain?

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is what I want to be convinced of. I want to know whether it is the policy of the House to allow all of our diplomats, consuls, and other officials to express their views to the country through the medium of the RECORD.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman will permit, I think it has been customary to allow insertion in the RECORD of speeches made by Senators or Members of the House, members of the Cabinet, or our ambassadors. I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that all of this outside matter ought to be kept out of the RECORD, and I intend to do what little I can to assist the gentleman in keeping it out, but I think we have made an exception and allowed the insertion of speeches delivered by Members of Congress, ex-Members of Congress, members of the Cabinet, and ambassadors.



Mr. UNDERHILL. If this is in line with our past policy, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. If objection is made, I shall read this speech into the RECORD. I had hoped not to take the time of the House, but I am going to place it in the RECORD.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. I join with my colleague from Massachusetts in desiring to keep out of the RECORD extraneous matter. There is no one more in favor of the reduction of the size of the RECORD and economies in that respect than I am, but I do think the instance brought up at the present time is one where we should not exercise the expulsion procedure. The address is a very able one. Many of us have read it, and in addition to that it was prepared by an official of the Government. Further, it was delivered by a former Member of this House, with whom many of us have been associated and for whom all of us have the highest regard. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think in the House policy expressed in regard to the inserting extraneous matter into the RECORD we ought to include the addresses of admirals of our Navy on the important defects in the policies of our Navy, when such admirals can not get them printed anywhere else without being punished for it? [Laughter.]

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I have not gone into that matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the press of the country carries the information that the State Department is just now conferring with the leading nations of the world in an effort to negotiate treaties to outlaw war.

Last June Ambassador A. B. Houghton, probably the foremost diplomat of America to-day, who served 10 years in Congress, was first ambassador to Germany after the World War, where he served 6 years, and who is now ambassador from this country to Great Britain, delivered an address to the graduating class of Harvard University in June last in which he advocated a change in the Constitution and the laws of the country on this question.

Ambassador Houghton's address is as follows:

#### PEACE

I want to talk to you a little while to-day about peace. What I have in mind to suggest, briefly, is certain considerations which would seem to indicate, if a more durable peace between them is desired, that the great self-governing peoples must undertake a new experiment in democratic government and extend the right of suffrage into international affairs. You understand, of course, that I am speaking for myself alone. What I shall say must not in any way be accepted as the position of my Government. I can only hope, however, that, if nowhere else, it will find some approval among those tens of millions of plain American men and women who want a durable peace and who are eager and willing to cooperate with other peoples to create a durable peace provided always that, in so doing, they are not asked to violate their own instinctive and fundamental political ideals and beliefs.

The difficulty of promoting a peace by agreement among the great self-governing powers roots in the fact that those charged with political authority assume the inevitability of war. They are ready to agree that peace is desirable and that war is a frightful, expensive, and irrational method of settling international disputes. In view of human experience, however, they see no other alternative. They are compelled, they say, to take human facts as they find them. And deep down in human nature they find racial and national instincts and prejudices which when appealed to have hitherto always resulted in a war spirit. They see no reason to believe that any other result may be expected in any future useful now to contemplate.

#### WILLING, NOT FORCED

Whatever else may be said to substantiate such a view of the ultimate relations between the self-governing nations, it plainly does not conform exactly to historical fact. War does not originate from time to time simply in a sudden and uncontrollable impulse on the part of one of these great national masses to go out and slaughter another. War is possible, no doubt, because these masses are willing, under conditions, to fight. But these conditions are themselves an integral part of the problem. Before a war is conceivable there must be an issue. And that issue, broadly speaking, is the outcome of a series of maneuvers by which the masses concerned are brought into positions of opposition. Obviously this maneuvering is not done by the masses themselves. Collectively and as individuals they have little, if anything, to do with the subtle and gradual shifting of international relationships. Their interests are directed to the more humble and prosaic task of earning a liv-

ing. The maneuvering is done by little groups of men called governments. These little groups seek constantly and naturally to gain supposed advantages of one sort and another for their own nationals. Out of their efforts to enlarge or to strengthen or to maintain the interests entrusted to their charge, the masses they represent are gradually maneuvered into positions which, to say the least, can not easily be surrendered. If the process continues, sooner or later a situation arises in which an agreement between these small groups becomes impossible. Then, on the ground that their lives and families and property are somehow involved and endangered, these great masses of men and women, roused by every power of organized appeal and propaganda, are ordered under arms, and war follows. The entire process is in control of the smaller groups. They make the issue. They declare the war. The masses they control simply obey.

Having put this power, or left this power in the hands of their governments, they find themselves at the critical moment, substantially helpless. And so, as individuals, they merely accept the decision and go out to pay the bills of war with their bodies and perhaps with their souls, in the hope that, if not they, then those who come after them may reap a benefit in some measure proportionate to its cost. And even the very men, through whose instrumentality, consciously or unconsciously, this dreadful catastrophe has been brought about explain it on the ground that human nature being what it is, any other determination was impossible—and will be, either now or hereafter.

#### NOT BIOLOGICAL

Now war may be, in fact, the inevitable result of a serious clash of national interests. It is possible that no method of reaching a peaceful settlement can be devised. But certainly we have no reason to base that assumed failure upon some inherent weakness of human nature. That simply begs the question. War can be said to be inevitable only if we assume, first, that the conditions which from time to time have led to war were themselves the result of a process of necessity; and, second, that the conditions under which men have been brought to fight in times past were, in fact, those precise conditions under which they would have fought if given a choice. Neither of these assumptions can possibly be maintained. It is conceivable, to say the least, that considering the cost the great masses of human beings involved might have preferred some other method of settling any particular dispute. And we know that the conditions which hitherto have led to war are the result of human volition and deliberate choice—not of the populations involved but of their governments. Even if we admit, as perhaps we must, that as long as governments possess the power, first, to create conditions which ultimately result in a clash of national interest; and, second, by declaring war to force those issues to a test of armed strength—even if we admit under these circumstances that history will merely repeat itself and war more or less inevitably follow—we have no reason to admit that a similar result would follow if the power to declare war were in the hands of the populations. That is precisely what we do not know.

The experiment has never been tried. And there are considerations which apparently point the other way.

First. The great self-governing peoples have shown themselves competent to manage their domestic affairs. Foreign affairs are merely an extension of domestic affairs. There is nothing mysterious about them. They are not a sort of arcana, wherein the laws of common morality are excluded and in which only cynical gentlemen of bilingual attainments are competent to play a rôle. They are, in the main, simply the natural and beneficial outcome of a desire to trade. They become potentially dangerous only when men who temporarily possess power undertake, for a supposed national advantage, to infringe either the liberties or the possessions of a neighboring people. Then they become very dangerous indeed. But in so far, at least, as the great self-governing peoples are concerned does a sound foreign policy now necessitate either? Or is such an effort as likely to grow out of great masses of men and women whose interests lie primarily in peace as out of small groups of men who think, perhaps, they can better the relations between them and, sometimes, as history has shown us, are willing to take a chance? It is conceivable, indeed, that what men call "national destiny" might safely be left to work itself out more slowly and in its own way and without quite so much conscious aid and direction.

#### THE TOLL OF WAR

Second. War has steadily increased its demands. Once it could be waged with profit. Now no gain can equal its cost. Once it could be waged by a relatively small proportion of the populations involved. Now it embraces all. Men and women alike must contribute to its will to destroy. Its proportions have become so formidable and its demands and consequences so ruinous that it threatens to wreck civilization itself. For the wars of the civilized mean the breakdown of civilization. Whatever may be said regarding war in the past, whatever advantages may have come of it, whatever good it may have accomplished, to-day the situation is radically changed. This new democratic era into which we are entering, wherein production is becoming more and more a world process and in which the relations of each one

of us is becoming more and more vitally dependent upon others, can not withstand the shock and dislocation and waste of war as easily as societies more primitively organized. Some check upon the use of this method must be found.

Third. While the fundamental relations between peoples are based, as at present, frankly and openly upon force, fear of attack becomes a natural and dominant consideration within each national group. Out of that fear springs, as a matter of course, the desire to increase armaments which, except for use against each other, are largely unnecessary. Each arms for defense, and each thus becomes potentially more able to attack and so more dangerous as a neighbor. What we do not always realize is that fear in this sense is fear of the concentrated power in the hands of governments to make war almost overnight. Such fear could not exist if the war-making power were diffused among a whole people. The tension would necessarily lessen. Time would be required before that power could again be focused. And time is the greatest ally of peace. But we may go even further. If this concentrated power, now in the hands of little groups of men called governments, were in fact diffused among their peoples, we may safely assert that they would be less inclined than now to develop situations out of which war might easily emerge. They could not be sure of their ability to carry such questionable plans through to completion. The mere fact that they had so managed a nation's business as to lead it to a dangerous crisis would be their condemnation. A new set of forces, not hitherto available to prevent war, would come into active operation.

#### THE ETERNAL AUTOCRAT

Fourth. The power to declare war stands on a different plane from all other powers of government. It is all-embracing and all-consuming. It subordinates all other powers to itself. It represents the highest act of sovereignty. It is the one power which of all others a self-governing people would logically reserve to itself, since it puts in jeopardy their collective lives and property. And yet, strangely enough, it is the one power they do not possess. We create governments primarily to protect our individual lives and property. To that end, we make laws and set up legislative safeguards, and if these prove unsatisfactory, we change them. It is only when all our lives and all our properties are suddenly involved in a great and supreme decision affecting peace or war that we cease to be self-governing. We accept the decision of others. The fact that self-governing peoples choose their own governments and are, therefore, presumably responsible for the actions and decisions of those governments, does not meet the issue. Those governments are never elected on the precise issue of peace or war. They are elected on domestic grounds and for domestic reasons. And a government elected primarily on an issue, let us say, such as the tariff, may not be at all representative when suddenly confronted by the need of a decision involving peace or war.

Such considerations are, of course, obvious enough. No sane human being would deny their compelling force if it were not for one doubt. And it is this. Are the plain men and women who make up the vast bulk of each of these self-governing nations as competent to determine if and when a war is necessary as the little groups of individuals who now form their Government? That is the doubt. And the answer to that doubt depends, obviously, upon our belief in popular government. There was a time when the ability of men and women to govern themselves under any conditions was disputed—and for precisely the same reasons. History and the rise of self-governing states have demonstrated not only that they are competent, but that they are happier and safer when they take on themselves the responsibility of government. Now we find ourselves face to face with that ancient question in a new guise—whether, although admittedly competent to govern themselves within their own frontiers, they are competent to control their fundamental relations with other peoples—in other words, to determine whether, at any given time, those relations shall be relations of peace or of war. That is the nub of the matter.

The great peoples are now self-governing. Each of them has set up a machinery of government which gives it effective control of its own domestic affairs. But in the region of international affairs the existing machinery of government has never been within their control and is not now.

Theoretically, of course, each self-governing people controls its relations with other peoples. Practically, by leaving the power to declare war in the hands of their governments they lose that control. It is conceivable, of course, that owing to some inherent moral instability or lack of understanding they are unfitted to assume that control—that they would treat lightly a decision which meant so much to them and to others and squander recklessly their lives and property in vain wars against their neighbors. But the presumption, at least, is in their favor. After all, it is their lives and their properties which are involved. And it is certainly within their power, if they will, by the appropriate contributory means either to permit the continuation of a system autocratic by nature, which always has resulted in war, and by which, as at present, their lives and property can be taken without consultation with them and without effective means of protest, or by agreement with other peoples to take upon their common shoulders the power to

decide whether at any particular time war is or is not necessary. If they choose the latter course, war is inevitable only in so far as they themselves want it to be. They will be in position to decide, for then the full power of sovereignty will finally be within their grasp. Only then will the democratic process be complete.

#### NO PEACE BASED ON FORCE

If what I have said has substantial basis in fact, it would seem that the time is at hand when a new experiment in democratic control must be made, and those peoples who have demonstrated their competence to govern themselves within their own national frontiers must assume direct responsibility for their relations with each other. Our Governments have shown themselves unable to protect us against war. They continue to act along well-defined grooves and in accordance with the dictates of a political theory which exalts nationalism and relies frankly upon the use of force, when necessary, to attain these ends. We have no apparent reason to hope for any change in their method and in their aims. The future, if they control it, seems likely to be merely an intensified repetition of the past. Personally I believe we can not safely continue to be democratic within our national frontiers and autocratic in our relations with the other self-governing peoples. A durable peace can not be based upon force. It must, if it exists at all, be based upon good will. And I believe profoundly that that practical good will exists, that the great self-governing peoples can safely trust one another, and that only a method of dealing between them, inherited from an outgrown system of autocratic government, prevents our recognition of that great and beneficent fact. We are caught in a process of our own making. And we must unmake it.

That, substantially, completes what I have to say. What remains is to discuss the means by which that possible extension of democratic control can be put into practical effect, and into this discussion I do not propose now to enter. Nevertheless, to make my argument complete, I must indicate very briefly two conditions which seem to me essential:

First. If so great a political experiment is to be tried, it must be frankly an international experiment. It can not be safely or expediently entered upon by one nation alone. Obviously, the experiment would have a greater chance of success if confined at the beginning to those peoples who are most alike in race and ancestry, who possess, roughly, the same degree of economic and political and educational advancement, accept the same standards of life, respond to the same appeals, and react to the same emotions—in other words, the great self-governing peoples. Obviously, too, such a proposition can only be brought before them by the consent and with the cooperation of their respective governments. A conference at which each is represented would, therefore, be a necessary preliminary.

#### ON THE PEOPLE'S HEADS

Second. The object of such a conference would be, of course, to determine whether each of these governments is prepared by proper legislative action to enable its people to accept or reject a proposition whereby a declaration of war against the other peoples in the group can be made only after the question has received the affirmative sanction of a majority of its qualified electors; and, following this, to enter into an agreement whereby in return for reciprocal pledges each shall agree not to attack the others for a term of—say—100 years. If, as a result of such a conference, these two propositions can be formulated and accepted, a day should be fixed on which all the peoples so pledged would be given an opportunity to vote for or against ratification—so that by the simultaneous action of the individual electors in all the great nations involved the full responsibility for that agreement would be dramatically brought home to each and each be made aware that the issue of peace or war between them will be thereafter in their own hands and control. Into such a conference, it seems to me, the plain people of America would be eager to enter. Certainly, nothing in our past, nothing in our political traditions, nothing in our accepted principles of government, prevents our entering into an agreement not to attack nations which agree not to attack us. In this way, and perhaps in this way only, can we join hands effectively with the other self-governing peoples in a common effort to secure a more durable peace. But the agreement I am contemplating must be something more than an agreement between governments. It must be an agreement between the peoples themselves.

I need hardly point out to you that if such an agreement could be reached it would leave untouched the relations between each of these powers and all the other powers not involved. Only, as between the peoples who made this compact, there would be this additional security. For as the chances of a lasting peace are greater in the hands of parliamentary governments than in the hands of autocrats, so I believe those chances will be greater still when in the hands of great masses of human beings whose interests lie in peace and who think in terms of peace and who know that their individual lives and property are the stake if peace is broken. At any rate, so far as I can see, no effective alternative is open. If the danger of war is to be lessened, a sufficient measure of control, it seems to me, can be obtained only when the



self-governing peoples definitely and constitutionally take the decision into their own hands.

Let me thank you now for the patience with which you have listened to me. I realize better than you possibly can how inadequate is the statement I have just made. But, however inadequate, it at least has this excuse, that it is an effort to point out an added security against war where it is most destructive and most dangerous—that is to say, between the peoples who are most alike, the self-governing peoples. Of course, if we are content with the present relations between them, we need no added security. But in view of the war which ended only eight years ago and of the peace that is even now being worked out, are we content?

#### INTERNATIONAL DAIRY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State concerning participation by the Government of the United States in the Eighth International Dairy Congress, which will be held in Great Britain in June-July, 1928, under the patronage of His Majesty King George V.

Concurring in the view of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture, as stated in the report, I request of Congress legislation authorizing acceptance of the invitation of the British Government to the Government of the United States to appoint delegates to that congress, and an appropriation of \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses of delegates.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 5, 1928.

#### CLAIM BY THE GOVERNMENT OF NORWAY FOR PAYMENT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway for the payment of interest on certain sums advanced by it for this Government in connection with its representation of American interests in Moscow, and I recommend that an appropriation be authorized to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 8, 1928.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1929

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Department of State, Department of Justice, Departments of Commerce and Labor. Pending that motion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] if we can agree on control of the time. It has been suggested that we let the debate run through to-day.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Let the debate run on to-day, and before the adjournment we can make some request for limitation. I assume that there will be coupled with the gentleman's motion a request that the time be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8269, and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate to-day be equally divided between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. SHREVE was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LEHLBACH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, before beginning discussion of the numerous items in the bill I wish to pay my respects to some of my associates on the committee who have been so kind in their cooperation in preparing the bill. I refer particularly to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN]. [Applause.]

The bill we have presented to you to-day calls for \$89,047,985.14. That, as you know, is divided between the four great departments of the Government covered by this bill.

These appropriations in the bill are \$1,536,630.07 in excess of the amount we appropriated last year. Permit me to say it is also \$169,900 under the estimates made by the Bureau of the Budget.

The total amount distributed under the four departments are as follows: Department of State, \$13,875,955.14; Department of Justice and judiciary, \$26,657,730. This is a decrease of \$227,705. The Department of Commerce, \$37,545,960, an increase of \$80,510. The Department of Labor, \$10,968,340, an increase of \$793,470.

Department	Appropriations, 1928 (including first deficiency act, 1928)	Budget estimates, 1929	Amount recommended in bill, 1929	Increase (+), decrease (-), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), decrease (-), bill compared with Budget estimates
State.....	\$12,985,599.57 <sup>1</sup>	\$13,875,955.14	\$13,875,955.14	+\$890,355.57	-----
Justice.....	\$26,885,435.50 <sup>2</sup>	26,784,630.00	26,657,730.00	-227,705.50	-\$128,900.00
Commerce.....	\$37,465,450.00	37,596,460.00	37,545,960.00	+\$80,510.00	+\$50,500.00
Labor.....	\$10,174,870.00 <sup>3</sup>	10,960,840.00	10,968,340.00	+\$793,470.00	+\$7,500.00
Total.....	\$87,511,355.07	89,217,885.14	89,047,985.14	+\$1,536,630.07	-\$169,900.00

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$971,713.16 in the first deficiency act of 1928.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$2,000 supplemental estimate.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$484,546 in the first deficiency act of 1928.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$838,000 in the first deficiency act of 1928.

<sup>5</sup> Includes \$40,354 in the first deficiency act of 1928.

<sup>6</sup> Includes supplemental estimate for Bureau of Immigration of \$235,000.

<sup>7</sup> Includes total of \$2,334,613.16 in first deficiency act of 1928.

Now, if the committee will permit, I should like it to indulge me to the extent of allowing me to analyze the figures and discuss some of the changes that have been made. The committee went extensively and exhaustively into the items in the bill. The hearings are very voluminous, and I would recommend that each and every Member of Congress read the hearings.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Department of State or, rather, its activities are separated or divided into five different groups or divisions: The department in Washington, including its passport bureaus throughout the United States, for which we have recommended \$1,462,365, an increase over 1928 of \$56,160; its Foreign Service organization, carrying \$9,117,600, an increase of \$330,316.84; the Foreign Service buildings and retirement funds, for which \$1,763,000 is necessary for the next year; certain international obligations for which the United States makes annual contributions. These amount to \$1,483,240.14, a decrease of \$456,871.27; and the United States Court for China, which requires an annual contribution of \$48,750. This then makes a total increase for the Department of State of \$890,355.57. This increase is mainly made up of certain items in the Foreign Service and an increase in the Foreign Service buildings fund and retirement fund to carry out the provisions of which there is contained the first contribution on the Government's part of \$213,000.

#### SALARIES, SECRETARY'S OFFICE

We have recommended a total of \$1,145,760 for salaries under the Secretary's office, which is the main fund out of which is paid the salaries for the Washington organization. This is an increase of \$56,160, and covers some salary increases totaling \$20,000, as well as an amount of \$10,780 for the salaries of four departmental employees to replace four Foreign Service officers now in the department who are badly needed in the field. The balance of the increase is to enable the department to bring up to date the cataloging in the library, which has been in arrears for several years.

## DEPARTMENTAL CONTINGENT AND PRINTING AND BINDING EXPENSES

We have allowed \$53,605 and \$200,000, respectively, for the department's local contingent and printing and binding expenses. This represents an increase of \$10,000 in each instance and is to be used for the purchase of additional file cases and the printing of record books, invoice forms, and visa forms for diplomatic and consular offices abroad.

My attention was called yesterday to the fact that there is a shortage in room. This appropriation will take care of that, and I am glad to inform the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bacon] that we have endeavored to take care of this matter and will supply the foreign offices with sufficient paper so that they may carry on their correspondence in a dignified way.

## CLERKS AT EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS

The appropriation for clerks at our embassies and legations abroad carries an increase of \$15,000, bringing the total up to \$390,000 for 1929. In some of the most important embassies, such as Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, and so forth, there is only one clerk available, and the increase we have allowed will permit of the appointment of an additional where they are most needed.

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS

For contingent expenses incident to the conduct of our foreign embassies, we have recommended a total of \$854,500, an increase for 1929 over 1928 of \$58,350. This is to provide for a skeleton force for each Government-owned mission building, varying with its size and the conditions in the country in which it is located, to consist of gardeners, housemen, janitors, and so forth, for the proper upkeep of these buildings. This is in accordance with the act of May 7, 1926, for the preservation of diplomatic and consular properties, and we believe is a very good thing in order to prevent deterioration of the properties in which our Government has already invested.

## CLERK HIRE, UNITED STATES CONSULATES

The department has been handicapped in many consulates in supplying requests from the Department of Commerce to keep current their trade lists and world-trade directory reports by reason of lack of clerk hire. To relieve this situation we have allowed an increase of \$60,000 in the amount for clerk hire to permit of the hiring of additional clerks to be appointed in those consulates where they are most needed. Including this addition, the amount recommended for 1929 for clerks at United States consulates is \$1,645,000.

The State Department supplies over 90 per cent of the world-trade directory reports which the Department of Commerce has on file. These practically constitute business rating of some 300,000 foreign buyers or prospective buyers of American merchandise. Moreover, these reports have to be revised annually.

There are besides lists of dealers in various kinds of business which it is necessary for consular officers to revise and check from time to time to insure their accuracy. During the period from January 1 to September 1, 1927, the State Department received from the Department of Commerce a total of 4,264 communications requesting a total of 6,860 trade lists, covering some 475 different kinds of commodities, be checked with or revised by consulates abroad. The number of names on these lists aggregated 58,000 and constituted a heavy demand upon the time of 320 consular officers. A letter from Commerce, dated October 10, 1927, states that in the fiscal year 1925-26, 2,500 lists were received from consuls about 55 per cent complete as to information; the 5,400 lists in 1927 were 90 per cent complete. In addition to these lists the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce requested some 1,096 world-trade directory reports on specific firms, each request made separately by Commerce. I submit a copy of the letter concerning the trade lists which I have just mentioned. The letter states that a further increase is expected.

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES, UNITED STATES CONSULATES

Similar to the contingent expenses for United States embassies, except that this amount is used for United States consulates, there is recommended in the bill \$1,005,000, which includes an increase over 1928 of \$30,000, which is required in the most part by a steady increase in rental of consulates abroad. This increase in rents is due to the inability to renew leases at the rentals heretofore paid, where, in those countries, by reason of leases specifying payments in local currency, more money is required to pay the rentals due to the steady betterment of local exchange.

## SALARIES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

After going quite fully into the needs for Foreign Service officers abroad, the committee recommended \$3,001,000, covering the salaries of 678 Foreign Service officers. This represents an increase of \$71,000, covering 20 additional officers. The depart-

ment estimated to us there are 25 consular offices being administered by clerks because of lack of career officers to properly represent them. This increase therefore will largely relieve the situation.

## POST ALLOWANCES

We have recommended a sum of \$100,000 for post allowances for the department, an increase of \$71,000 over the current year. These allowances represent a fund which is designed to enable the President, in his discretion, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to the Foreign Service officers of the department assigned to posts in those countries of the world where, by reason of unusually high living expenses and adverse conditions of foreign exchange, their salary is not sufficient to enable them to live. The department figures that this increase is quite necessary because of the constant resignations from the service of officers unable to meet the rising expenses of living abroad, and this is to be used to buttress up such salaries usually by small amounts in those instances where it is most needed.

## FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS FUND

Congressman PORTER, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and chairman of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, authorized in the Foreign Service buildings act, appeared before our committee in support of the Budget estimate of \$1,300,000 to carry out part of the authorization contained in this act and made a very interesting statement, which appears in the hearings at page 202. As the House knows, the act I have referred to authorized an expenditure of \$10,000,000. Including amounts carried in deficiency acts and this estimate, there will have been made available for the acquisition of sites and placing buildings thereon, by the 1st of July, 1928, \$2,435,000. This is less than the \$2,000,000 per annum authorized to be appropriated and less than the \$3,402,472 expenditure approved by the commission, but it is all that is required up to this time for expenditure. Projects approved so far are located as follows, an explanation of each appearing in the hearings: Panama City, London, Tirana, Albania, Managua, Nicaragua, Yokohama, Penang, Paris, Calcutta, Monrovia, Rio de Janeiro, Shanghai, Mukden, Amoy, and Tokyo. I should like to state that the motive which has actuated the buildings commission in their selection of projects has been the choice first of those posts where climatic conditions make service perilous and it is believed that proper housing conditions will relieve the situation.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman tell us where we can find information as to what is to be expended in each of these places, and what sort of structure is provided for? Can the gentleman give that information with reference to any particular point?

Mr. SHREVE. I am free to say to the gentleman that Congressman PORTER came before our committee and went into great detail as to the construction of these buildings, which statement appears on page 202 of the hearings. He also showed some motion pictures of the projects. He showed the condition at the present time and indicated what was proposed in the way of buildings. It is very interesting and illuminating, and I am sure that Mr. PORTER will be pleased some evening to show the motion pictures again, showing exactly what they are proposing to do.

Mr. DENISON. Does this bill provide an item for the construction of a building in Panama City?

Mr. SHREVE. We carry a general provision, and the selection of the projects and allocation of the money is made by the commission and the department. The appropriation is in a lump-sum amount. The projects are itemized in the hearings, which include Panama City.

Mr. DENISON. It is very commendable that there is to be constructed a building in Panama City. There is none more needed anywhere than there.

Mr. SHREVE. The committee was inclined to think that this commission was proceeding very wisely, and was really starting a wonderful work. Our country should really be on a par with any other country in the matter of buildings for our representatives in foreign countries.

## FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Now, we have included in the bill the Budget estimate of \$213,000, which is the first contribution on the part of the Government toward carrying out the provisions of section 18 (a) of the act of May 24, 1924—the Rogers Act—which authorizes annual estimates to be submitted of appropriations necessary to continue in full force the retirement and disability system established by that section.



## STATUE OF HENRY CLAY, CARACAS, VENEZUELA

Also an amount of \$41,000 toward the erection of a bronze statue of Henry Clay at Caracas, Venezuela, in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 24, 1927.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

There are few changes in the appropriations we have recommended for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year 1929, as against 1928. The total amount involved is \$26,657,730. While on the face this appears like a reduction of \$126,000 under 1928, this reduction is more than offset when consideration is taken of \$250,000 contained in the last deficiency act for the purchase and installation of new boilers and other machinery and which is included in the comparison.

Object	Appropriations, 1928	Budget estimates, 1929	Amount recommended in the bill 1929	Increase (+), or decrease (-), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 Budget estimates
Department of Justice proper	\$4,375,165.00	\$4,396,950.00	\$4,398,050.00	+\$22,885.00	+\$1,100.00
Judicial	16,893,380.50	16,842,370.00	16,744,370.00	-149,010.50	-98,000.00
Penal and correctional institutions	5,616,890.00	5,545,310.00	5,515,310.00	-101,580.00	-30,000.00
Total	126,885,435.00	26,784,630.00	26,657,730.00	-227,705.00	-126,900.00

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$484,546 in first deficiency act of 1928.

## SALARIES, ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

I should like to call the committee's attention to the fact that in the recent deficiency act which passed this House a sum was included for the payment of additional salaries under the Attorney General's office of \$25,400 for the last six months of this current fiscal year. For those additional positions we have included, together with the amount for the regular salary roll of the Attorney General's office, the amount necessary for their payment for the whole of the next fiscal year, making the amount available for 1929 for the Attorney General \$1,066,600.

## SALARIES, FEES, AND EXPENSES FOR UNITED STATES MARSHALS AND THEIR DEPUTIES

We have increased the Budget estimate for the salaries of United States marshals and their deputies by \$7,500, making the amount available for 1929 for this purpose \$3,672,500. This, added to the amount the committee granted last year for the same purpose, will give further nominal increases to the salaries of the lower-grade marshals and their deputies.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND THEIR REGULAR ASSISTANTS

After listening carefully to the requirements of the district attorneys' offices and their assistants we added \$15,000 over the Budget estimates to the two appropriations under which these expenses fall, making the amounts available for 1929 \$1,440 and \$1,130,000, respectively. In connection with the Budget estimates this represents an increase of \$40,000 and \$30,000 over 1928, which is to be used for salary increases for assistant district attorneys and their clerks. In allowing these increases in this most important aspect of the department's work we believe that it will have a most salutary influence in those cases where faithful and efficient service warrant increased compensation.

## SALARIES OF CLERKS OF UNITED STATES COURTS

Consistent with an additional amount allowed in the first deficiency act of 1928 for the addition of 11 employees in different United States court jurisdictions, we have suggested an appropriation in the bill before you an amount of \$1,820,000 for the salaries of clerks of United States courts. This amount allows a small amount also for the increased compensation of some of the deputy clerks in these courts.

## MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURTS

When we had the estimate for miscellaneous expenses for United States courts under advisement we took into full consideration an addition, which was contained in the Budget estimates of \$119,000, which was to cover the salaries of 34 law clerks at \$3,000 each and their traveling expenses. These clerks were to be used for the United States circuit judges. We disallowed this whole amount and deleted the language providing for the employment of these clerks both because we did not think them necessary and because no legislation authorizing their appointment was on the statute books of the Government.

In traveling around over the country we discovered that the United States marshals and United States attorneys and

deputy United States attorneys have been very poorly paid. We began last year with some recommendations to the Department of Justice, hoping that we might be able to relieve this situation. As I have stated, we are carrying some additional appropriations this year, so far as we can, to cover some of these inequalities.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

## MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. HUDSPETH. I was hoping that the gentleman would touch on the matter of the Mexican Boundary Claims Commission. I was looking to see if it was mentioned in the hearings, but I do not find it. I would like to ask the gentleman in regard to the special and general Mexican Claims Commission. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the progress that is being made concerning the adjudication of those claims by this commission, and when they will probably report those claims or pass upon them? That is a matter which, of course, is of very great interest to the people along the Rio Grande and the border section of Texas.

Mr. SHREVE. I am glad to say to the gentleman that the American agent of that commission appeared before the committee and made a very satisfactory statement, and assured us that they were making progress; that they would endeavor to finish the work within the time fixed. A very large number of claims has been filed on both sides of the river, and they require careful investigation of the commission first, and afterwards that of the two Governments, in order to be adjudicated. The commission has been making good progress.

## WATER BOUNDARY COMMISSION

As to the Water Boundary Commission, I may say the situation is well in hand, and we have there now a gentleman who is actively devoting his time and attention to it. I refer to Mr. Lawson, an old reclamation man, and he is proceeding rapidly with the work. The commissioner on the other side of the line informed us last year that they were about ready to report.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am gratified to get that information. I understand that the two boundary commissioners representing the United States and Mexico have agreed upon a treaty and a survey of the land, so far as the El Paso Valley is concerned, and that that treaty is now before the State Department here and before the State Department of Mexico. I just wanted to get that information which the gentleman has given me in regard to the claims commission. Can the gentleman inform me what is the limit fixed by the law as to time?

Mr. SHREVE. I think it is about a year now.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. While we are on that Mexican boundary question, may I ask the gentleman concerning the so-called commission, concerning the distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande? Does the gentleman's bill provide for that purpose?

Mr. SHREVE. We were just speaking of that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What have you done with that appropriation?

Mr. SHREVE. We have increased that appropriation.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. It is all they will be able to utilize?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; we have provided all the money they needed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Is there any information before your committee as to when they will have their first joint meeting?

Mr. SHREVE. No. The gentleman from Alabama, my colleague [Mr. OLIVER], may probably recall.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I understood the State Department to say that they would suggest that an early date be fixed for the meeting, but there is no definite time fixed by the commission for its meeting.

Mr. SHREVE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

## UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to go back to the point the gentleman was referring to at the time he yielded to the gentleman from Texas and that is the appropriation for United States marshals and deputies. Last year the appropriation was increased \$78,320 to take care of about 690 deputies in the lower salaried grades. In this bill the salaries of the marshals are readjusted and properly so, but I desire to direct the gen-

tleman's attention to the condition which exists in the southern district of New York and the eastern district of New York. These deputies, who have a great many more duties to perform than deputies in the smaller districts, are receiving pay that is hardly a living wage for New York City. As the gentleman knows, they have to escort prisoners to Atlanta, and they have to serve injunction papers.

It is a very serious condition there. Men are getting \$1,700 and some are getting as little as \$1,500. I know of one case where a man does not have enough to get decent clothes. Surely we ought to pay them as much as a police officer receives in that same community. At the proper time I am going to offer an amendment and I assure the gentleman the situation there is really one of grave concern. I hope the gentleman and his committee will in the meantime look into the matter.

Mr. SHREVE. The committee has already looked into it. We had before the committee the United States district attorney of New York and he made a wonderful statement, so we are fully familiar with all the facts the gentleman from New York has just stated, and it was our endeavor in this bill to correct the conditions he has mentioned.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But you do not.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, we commenced last year. There was some money last year that was saved for the increase of salaries. However I want to be shown and want to be sure, because I feel confident the bill will cover the situation. I suggest to the gentleman that he take up the matter with the Attorney General's office and let us know about it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will do that within the next 24 hours.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. I am glad the committee is pursuing this policy with reference to marshals and deputies. Has the committee done anything with reference to the deputy clerks of the United States district courts?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; we are also taking care of the clerks and deputies.

Mr. NEWTON. Because there is a situation there that certainly must be remedied.

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that that situation needed some correction, but for two years, now, we have been trying to correct it. In the course of time it will be corrected all over the country, but it takes time to do those things. More than that, there is a very great difference in the activities of the various courts over the United States and what will apply to one district does not apply to another. In some sections of the country the courts have not as much to do as others and hence the work of the clerks varies, while in the section from which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] comes they are overwhelmingly worked. We are trying to work out a system that will comprehensively take care of all of the United States.

Mr. NEWTON. I know of an instance of a deputy clerk who, I think, is getting around \$1,800 or \$1,900 a year. He has to spend all of his time at his work and his experience is invaluable to the practitioner who only gets into the Federal court now and then. I am very glad to know the committee has taken this action.

Mr. SHREVE. We realize the very great importance of that matter.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

#### DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND THEIR ASSISTANTS

Mr. SNELL. I was very much interested in the allowances that are made for the salaries and expenses of the district attorneys and assistant district attorneys. I notice you have increased the current appropriation by \$40,000. This is to cover the proposed adjustment of compensation in the offices of United States district attorneys, including their clerks, and I was wondering what you could do toward increasing the salaries of district attorneys with such a small amount as \$40,000.

Mr. SHREVE. They will get a nominal increase because there are not so many of them in the United States.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. It might mean an increase of 50 cents.

Mr. SHREVE. No; the gentleman from Iowa is a bad mathematician.

Mr. SNELL. Just how do you expect that to increase the salaries of these officials?

Mr. SHREVE. Many will get an increase, but this is not distributed to everybody. It is intended for use in such cases as were mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], but it is not intended for those smaller towns where such conditions do not prevail.

Mr. SNELL. Then this money is to be used in the discretion of the Department of Justice, and they will place it where they see fit?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the idea.

Mr. SNELL. How much extra is provided for assistant district attorneys?

Mr. SHREVE. Thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. SNELL. We have this situation in the northern district of New York. The department has authorized them to appoint an assistant, and they want to get an assistant for \$2,400. Such a man, however, will go up against a man who in one case will get a fee of \$10,000, and I would like to know what is the use of sending a boy to do a man's work in a proposition of that kind, when the proposition, perhaps, involves Government property to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. SHREVE. That does not just quite explain the situation.

Mr. SNELL. I am asking for information.

Mr. SHREVE. Many of these men in the Department of Justice are capable of earning four, five, or six times as much money as they are getting.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is true.

Mr. SHREVE. But they are devoting a few years to work in the Department of Justice for the purpose of getting a background so that they may go out to one of the great cities and almost instantly acquire a practice. You will find that is true in many of the departments, especially in the Patent Office, where men are working for less money than they could receive on the outside. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the Government can not pay what private industry and individuals pay. But this is the point: Those men are rendering a great service and I think they are very efficient, although they are getting small pay.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman's committee allowed as much as the Department of Justice has thought necessary in order to get proper men to fill these positions that are vacant or the ones that are filled at the present time by men who are not really capable of doing the work.

Mr. SHREVE. I am not aware there are any such offices filled by men not capable of doing the work.

Mr. SNELL. No; I do not know that I should have said that. I think perhaps that should have been left out; but they are not getting men of the type they want.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, I will not say that, but I will say they are not retaining the men they want. They are getting good men, but after a man has acquired this background, after being with the Department of Justice here in Washington for a time, he goes out somewhere and opens up an office for himself and profits by the wide experience he has had in the department here.

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate that will always be true regardless of what we pay them.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. But you have allowed the Department of Justice practically what they have asked for, have you?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; and in some instances we have increased the estimate of the Budget.

Mr. SNELL. Then if I should go to the Department of Justice with a specific case, if they agree with me, they can not say they would be glad to grant the request, but the Committee on Appropriations has not granted them enough money.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, I have never heard of such a statement being made.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think the gentleman from New York would wish any Member of Congress to give an assurance like that.

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. SNELL. That is a pretty general statement.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Some Members of Congress probably like to pass the buck and many on the outside like to do the same thing, and seldom can Congress, if ever, be able to say that what we have done has absolutely satisfied everybody. We have, of our own volition, increased the amount recommended by the Budget for district attorneys and assistants to district attorneys, and we have also carried a large sum to provide for the employment of special assistants in cases of importance requiring unusual skill. The Attorney General came before the committee, and it seemed to me that he was very well satisfied with what the committee had given the department, and he registered no protest.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I have in mind. In the opinion of the committee they have given everything asked for that was reasonable and fair to provide ample assistance in this department.



Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We could, perhaps, in justice, have raised some salaries. There are many rendering special services who are not paid what a lawyer on the outside could get.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman about that; but I had in mind that in a general way they are satisfied.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We could, in justice, have raised the salary of a good many, but, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], we must leave that largely to the Attorney General.

Mr. SNELL. It would seem to me from the statements made by the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have provided a reasonable amount to take care of these conditions as they exist throughout the country at the present time, in accordance with the case presented to the Appropriations Committee by the Department of Justice.

Mr. SHREVE. That is the aim of the committee.

Mr. SNELL. That is what I wanted to have clear in my own mind, and I think it is a matter that should be cleared up at this time.

Mr. SHREVE. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has suggested, we have provided funds for special assistants to provide for cases where especial legal talent is desired, and I am glad to hear that the gentleman from New York is satisfied with the arrangement.

#### DEPUTY MARSHALS

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not want to tire my friend, and this is a matter that possibly the gentleman went over in the hearings, because the gentleman mentioned something about raising the salary of deputy marshals. Out in my section of the country these officials are called upon to enforce all of the laws—immigration, labor, prohibition, and so forth—and I do not think they get appropriate salaries for the work they are doing.

Mr. SHREVE. We have tried to remedy that. We began last year when they were given increases. We have given them more this year.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I beg the gentleman's pardon for going over the matter again, as I am sure the gentleman has had the matter under consideration.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; much that I have said about the assistant district attorneys also applies to the deputy marshals. There are sections of the country where they are seriously overworked, but there are other sections where they do not have so much to do.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And is this left to the discretion of the Attorney General?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WELLER. With reference to the assistant district attorneys in the southern district of New York, the gentleman possibly recalls that I made a speech on that subject last year.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WELLER. Does this bill contemplate any increase in salary for these men?

Mr. SHREVE. We have granted a slight increase, which I presume the Department of Justice will allocate in such manner that it will in part become effective in New York City. I hope so.

Mr. WELLER. We have the gentleman's best wishes anyway.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Is that the best the gentleman can do? Must the Department of Justice make the allocation?

Mr. SHREVE. We never make the allocation here, as the gentleman knows. These appropriations are carried in lump-sum amounts for the department's use.

#### PENAL INSTITUTIONS

As you gentlemen know, the control and management of prisoners convicted of violations of United States statutes has been vested in the Attorney General. There are six penal units for the housing of Federal prisoners under his jurisdiction, as well as a large fund for the support of the same type of prisoners in other institutions than Federal. These institutions and the amounts for their upkeep as recommended are as follows:

Object	Appropriations, 1928	Estimates, 1929	Amount recommended in bill for 1929	Increase (+) decrease (-), bill compared with 1928	Increase (+) decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 estimates
<b>PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS</b>					
Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.	\$866,740	\$890,000	\$880,000	+\$13,260	-\$10,000
Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga. (including \$250,000, first deficiency act, 1928)	1,100,000	852,500	852,500	-247,500	-----
Penitentiary, McNeil Island, Wash. (including \$75,150 in first deficiency act, 1928)	478,150	509,600	509,600	+31,450	-----
Federal Industrial Institution for Women, Alderson, W. Va.	230,000	275,000	260,000	+30,000	-15,000
U. S. Industrial Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio	360,000	372,500	372,500	+12,500	-----
National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.	240,000	252,710	252,710	+12,710	-----
Probation system, United States courts	30,000	30,000	25,000	-5,000	-5,000
Support of prisoners	2,300,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	+50,000	-----
Inspection of prisons and prisoners	12,000	13,000	13,000	+1,000	-----
Total, penal and correctional institutions	5,616,890	5,545,310	5,515,310	-101,580	-30,000

We have recommended the Budget estimate in each instance, with the exception of the penitentiary at Leavenworth and the Federal Industrial Institution at Alderson for women. In these two instances we made reductions.

I might say that the National Industrial Institution for Women is the newest institution that the United States Government has, and it is being constructed on modern lines and being managed with the most enlightened methods as to the handling of female prisoners.

The expense of maintenance is very high for the reason that the population has by no means reached its limit. The Industrial Reformatory at Chillicothe is another new institution and where men are doing the work, and they have about 300 prisoners there now who are being well taken care of. The institution seems to be getting along fairly well.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The total appropriation recommended for the Department of Commerce, including the Secretary's office and all of the bureaus under its jurisdiction, is \$37,545,960, which is \$80,510 more than the appropriations under which the department is now operating, and \$50,500 less than the Budget estimates. Following is a list of the bureaus in the department, showing the current appropriation for each, the Budget estimate, the amounts recommended in the bill, and the increases or decreases:

Bureau	Appropriations 1928	Estimates 1929	Amount recommended in the bill for 1929	Increase (+), decrease (-), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 estimates
Secretary's office	\$2,435,100	\$2,520,100	\$2,500,100	+\$65,000	-\$20,000
Enforcement of wireless communication laws	304,000	320,000	320,000	+16,000	-----
Commercial air navigation	3,791,500	3,911,850	3,871,850	+180,350	-40,000
Foreign and Domestic Commerce	3,721,957	4,162,357	4,182,357	+400,400	+20,000
Census	2,164,960	2,048,200	2,048,200	-116,760	-----
Steamboat Inspection Service	1,080,060	1,109,060	1,114,060	+34,000	+5,000
Navigation	314,020	330,880	330,880	+16,860	-----
Standards	2,350,435	2,241,055	2,246,055	-104,380	+5,000
Lighthouses	10,677,250	11,145,250	11,145,250	+468,000	-----
Coast and Geodetic Survey	2,756,590	2,342,080	2,347,580	-409,010	+5,500
Fisheries	2,021,568	1,969,748	2,003,748	-17,820	+4,000
Patent Office	2,822,860	2,903,800	2,903,800	+80,940	-----
Mines	3,025,150	2,562,080	2,532,080	-493,070	-30,000
	\$37,465,450	37,596,460	37,545,960	-\$80,510	-\$50,500

<sup>1</sup> Because of some of the appropriation having been made available for 1927 there is in reality an increase for 1929 over 1928 of about \$500,000.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$838,000 in first deficiency act, 1928.

#### THE ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO WIRELESS COMMUNICATION

The committee recommended a substantial appropriation for the enforcement of wireless communication laws when the pres-

ent radio activities throughout the country necessitated some Government supervision. During that year, however, following court decisions and an opinion rendered by the Attorney General to the effect that the Department of Commerce was without authority to enforce existing regulations relating to broadcasting stations, over \$100,000 was returned to the Treasury as unexpended. Since that time, however, regulatory legislation has been enacted empowering the radio division of the department to supervise all commercial and private radio stations, observe the terms of their licenses relating to the use of wave lengths and power, and hours of operation. It assigns call letters to all stations and examines and licenses radio operators, both commercial and amateur. There has been included in the recent deficiency act \$84,000 for the balance of the present fiscal year to enable the division to carry out the provisions of the act mentioned. For the division for 1929 we recommend \$304,000, which is a commensurate increase over 1928 when consideration is taken of the fact that these additional duties for the present year will only have been undertaken for a period of six months.

Another important branch of the service relates to commercial aeronautics.

#### AERONAUTICS BRANCH

For the information of those Members who were not here when the important work of lighting and maintaining our airways was initiated, I think it would be well to call attention to the organization of the aeronautics branch and what has been accomplished heretofore.

The aeronautics branch of the department was organized under the air commerce act, approved May 20, 1926. It performs the functions entrusted to the Secretary of Commerce by the provisions of that act. These include: The establishment and maintenance of civil airways and their equipment with intermediate landing fields, beacon lights, signal and radio apparatus, and other aids to air navigation; the establishment and enforcement of air traffic rules; the inspection and licensing of aircraft; the collection and dissemination of information pertaining to air commerce, including data concerning the causes of accidents; the establishment of a suitable weather service on airways; the charting of airways and the publication of air maps; the promotion of air commerce, industry, and trade; and the conduct of scientific research and development work tending to the improvement of facilities for air navigation. The act provided for the rating of air ports as to suitability and for the encouragement of the establishment and maintenance of air ports by municipalities. When operations authorized by the act were commenced the intention was that, so far as practicable, the duties imposed should be distributed among existing agencies of the department. Accordingly the task of establishing, maintaining, and operating aids to navigation along air routes was assigned to the airways division, operated as a part of the Lighthouse Service; the mapping of air routes under the airway mapping section, which is a part of the organization of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and the scientific research for the improvement of air-navigation aids to the aeronautical research division, which is a part of the Bureau of Standards. For the examination and licensing of aircraft and airmen, the enforcement of air traffic rules, and for the collection and dissemination of aeronautical information new divisions were set up in the department, namely, the air regulations division and the air information division.

The appropriations which cover the activities of this branch of the department are for convenience of allocation carried under two funds: One, aircraft in commerce, which covers the Washington activities as well as the inspection of aircraft, and for which we have included \$662,000. This represents a reduction under the Budget of \$40,000, covering the salaries of 10 inspectors. In the current year they are using the services of 20 inspectors, and the estimates called for 50 in 1929. The committee felt justified in reducing this amount by 10 in view of the authorization allowed in the bill for the purchase of five additional airplanes, which will permit the inspectors to travel from one place to another for inspection purposes much quicker. The other fund, air navigational facilities, which is for the cost of establishing and maintaining civil airways, carries an appropriation in the bill of \$3,209,850, an increase over 1928 of \$402,860. This will permit of the lighting of 2,500 additional miles of airways during 1929, which will make a total mileage of airways lighted in the United States of 10,012.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In that connection it may be well to say that we were of the opinion that 40 inspectors, if supplied with airplanes, would do more work than 50 largely required to go by train.

#### BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. I want to say a word about the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce this year. Our increases have been considerable, and it may be of interest to the House to know just what they are. For the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for 1929 we have recommended the total of \$4,520,857. This represents the large increase over 1928 of \$470,400, and an increase we made over the Budget estimate of \$20,000. These increases are distributed among the different funds of the bureau as follows:

Purpose	Appropriations, 1928	Estimates, 1929	Amount recommended, 1929	Increase (+), decrease (-), bill compared with 1928 appropriations	Increase (+), decrease (-), bill compared with estimates
Salaries, director's office.....	\$247,887	\$252,887	\$252,887	+\$5,000	-----
Printing and binding.....	240,500	250,500	250,500	+10,000	-----
Contingent expenses.....	108,000	108,000	108,000	-----	-----
Promoting commerce in Europe.....	808,992	864,143	844,143	+35,151	-\$20,000
Promoting commerce in South America.....	410,791	458,817	458,817	+48,026	-----
Promoting commerce in Far East.....	333,187	365,000	365,000	+31,813	-----
Promoting commerce in Africa.....	-----	85,010	105,010	+105,010	+20,000
District and cooperative offices.....	435,000	495,000	495,000	+60,000	-----
China trade act.....	30,000	30,000	30,000	-----	-----
Export industries.....	810,440	875,000	875,000	+64,560	-----
Domestic commerce.....	199,160	255,000	275,000	+75,840	+20,000
Customs statistics.....	335,000	335,000	335,000	-----	-----
Restrictions and regulations of foreign trade.....	35,000	50,000	50,000	+15,000	-----
Directory of foreign buyers.....	30,000	45,000	45,000	+15,000	-----
Transportation of remains.....	1,500	1,500	1,500	-----	-----
Traveling expenses.....	45,000	50,000	50,000	+5,000	-----
	4,070,457	4,520,857	4,540,857	+470,400	+20,000

Despite this large increase, most of which was indicated in the Budget estimates, our committee was deluged this year with requests of every description, and it held hearings for over three days permitting more than 60-odd various commercial organizations to appear before it, making requests which if they had been granted would have totaled over \$2,000,000 more than the increase allowed.

In 1920, when the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce first started expanding its appropriations were \$1,085,460. As already stated, the recommendations for 1929 are \$4,540,857, an increase of \$3,455,397 since that time, and less than \$500,000 of the amount of \$5,000,000 stated to the committee last year by the director as the sum that would represent "a more or less complete institution."

A large number of requests were made for economic surveys covering every description and every type of manufacture. The committee has recommended no appropriation for any of these numerous requests from these outside organizations, recognizing as it does that there is being carried in one fund alone under the bureau an appropriation of \$495,000 for the maintenance of 26 district offices throughout the United States and another appropriation supplementing the aid, the district offices are already giving to domestic commercial interests in the United States amounting to \$275,000.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. There was a request made of the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is the chairman, for a very substantial addition in the number of trade commissioners, commodity commissioners. I note that that request has not been met. I am inclined to agree with the report of the committee in that respect, but in going over the report on page 23 I fear there is something there which might indicate a critical attitude upon the part of the committee of the work being done by the present commodity representatives, or divisions in respect to commodities.

Mr. SHREVE. Not as to the divisions nor to the work a limited number of "commodity" trade commissioners might do, but our criticism is to the abnormal number of requests for them.

Mr. NEWTON. I wanted to be sure about that.

Mr. SHREVE. The only thing the committee desired to do was to impress upon the country the situation as to the future. Last year at the suggestion of the director who stated that at most this innovation would never apply to more than a dozen major commodities and only then to very necessary situations.

But the idea has spread in the short space of time of less than a year to all over the United States, so that every town



and hamlet wants a commodity expert sent over to represent some particular business in that particular town or commodity in a foreign country, until the thing has got to be intolerable. That is the reason for our report and why we intend following the original idea of a very limited number. We do not intend to tolerate the thought that every industry in the United States is to have a traveling Government representative. We will, however, make those points of contact between the great industries of our country and foreign governments. I know of one particular case in the old country where a particular kind of horn was provided for in a city ordinance. The ordinary salesman could not go to the officials of that town and have them change that ordinance. It required a Government official, and our commercial attaché, representing this Government, went and got in contact with an official of the foreign government, and he succeeded in that way in having the ordinance changed in respect to that particular horn. That is the sort of thing that we intend to cover. We are not providing salesmen for every manufacturing institution all over the United States, sending them abroad to represent some particular activity, but it is only when they can get this particular information that we propose to help them, and we will always be ready to help them under those circumstances.

Mr. NEWTON. I am very glad to have the gentleman's attitude in that respect, because my own experience is that those divisions in respect to commodities, in Washington here, have done very fine work. I would not want to see that work curtailed, and I sympathize with the committee in its attitude toward all of these extravagant demands.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; the commodity divisions here in the city are rendering quite valuable service, but so far as "commodity" trade commissioners are concerned we were swamped. We spent two or three days at the end of our hearings to hear gentlemen coming from all over the United States—150 to 200 witnesses—and most of them came representing those particular activities that have been taken care of. It seems to me that the country at large did not realize the splendid foreign organization already set up abroad giving service, and service that was being rendered everywhere in foreign countries by our foreign offices.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. I direct the attention of the gentleman to the question of regional economic surveys, which is covered in the report, and which indicates a rather critical attitude on the part of the committee toward the regional surveys. The gentleman knows that I appeared before the committee. What is the attitude of the committee on that?

Mr. SHREVE. What I have said pertaining to the other matter might apply to this. We did not object to the idea of brief economic surveys made in the United States, but we do object to Erie County in Pennsylvania or some other county in some other State, or to some city like Boston or Philadelphia, coming and asking us for a survey of their community, which, judged by the sample before me, covers every conceivable subject, from vital statistics to taxation, agriculture, shipping, and so forth, contained in 477 printed pages and duplicating work of our other Government organizations such as the Bureau of the Census, Department of Agriculture, and so forth. Furthermore, just as soon as word passed out that there was a survey made in the Southwest, everybody all over the country wanted a survey of their particular district. I had one letter from Washington in which it was stated that the writer thought that the Government could do the job very much better than their particular local chamber of commerce.

Mr. KELLY. The gentleman does not mean to limit the regional surveys of a comprehensive view of the United States, does he, by regions, to carry out the very purpose of the law which is to compile and collect information on raw materials and manufactures?

Mr. SHREVE. I will not say that I am opposed to it. As I have already stated, I do not object to brief economic surveys of broad geographical sections of the United States, but to a voluminous, expensive document, like the one before me, covering, as I have also said, every phase of life in a specified community, much of the data already available from other Government institutions and heretofore collected by them at Government expense, I do object. The matter should proceed very slowly and be worked out carefully and studied to avoid duplication, and then in the course of a year or two see whether they are so universally necessary.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the attitude of the committee might well be gathered from the fact that we have continued an appropriation of last year, used for making and completing one survey, and which will now be available for other surveys. We added \$15,000, which will be available for that purpose.

Mr. KELLY. I was going to ask whether that could be used for such a service?

Mr. SHREVE. The gentleman can come to his own conclusion as to that.

Mr. KELLY. I think the south coast should be given a survey, and perhaps the manufacturing districts of the South Atlantic should have a survey.

Mr. SHREVE. With what we added and what was remaining in the fund we believe there is enough to take care of the expenditures under this fund.

Mr. KELLY. Then the report may be said to be somewhat exaggerated?

Mr. SHREVE. No; it is not. We have covered the situation fully. I wish to say another word about the organization abroad. We are not inclined to send out assistants for anything more than to provide for those circumstances which I have tried to describe.

Despite a foreign organization of over 60 offices, employing over 150 trade commissioners and assistant trade commissioners, not including numerous clerical assistants, at an annual cost to the Government alone of nearly \$2,000,000 for this branch of the bureau's work alone, the committee had more than 25 requests to appoint any number of so-called "commodity" or "special" trade commissioners to travel over the territory already occupied by these foreign offices mentioned, but to represent some particular commodity or branch of manufactures. I ask you in all candor, would any large commercial organization, represented internationally and spending \$2,000,000 annually for over 60 offices, on top of this great outlay duplicate the work these offices would be supposed to be doing by sending additional high-salaried individuals into different parts of the world? Obviously, it would not. If, perchance, it had some particular line of merchandise it wished to "push," it would communicate with the offices in question and indicate that their activities should be increased in that direction. In fact, I put this parallel up to one official of a very large company in the United States and he immediately saw the duplication of effort and expenditure involved. Further, that he had made a request of one of the bureau's offices on the very type of manufacture he at first desired several "commodity" trade commissioners to represent, and he stated that he received all the information and service he could possibly wish for. This procedure was started by the bureau last year with several such representatives, with the idea that it never would expand to the extreme proportions the requests we have received indicate it would if allowed to continue, even in the short space of time of six months. Furthermore, I do not, and the committee does not conceive it to be the function of the Government to single out particular or individual types of commodities and manufactures in the United States, either in its already established offices, or the so-called "commodity" commissioner, if we had approved the continuance of the idea. Rather, it is the department's function to assist foreign and domestic trade and commerce nationally. Frankly, gentlemen, if this procedure were permitted to continue, it would be but a short time before you were asked to increase the bureau's already substantial appropriation by several millions of dollars to duplicate work that its foreign offices, already amply staffed, have already done and are doing. I hope, therefore, that the committee's recommendations will stand, which as I have already stated, contain a total increase of \$470,400.

#### BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

We have recommended for the Census Bureau the Budget estimate of \$2,048,200, and which includes an amount of \$110,000, being the first appropriation toward starting the preliminary work necessary for the fifteenth decennial census of the United States.

#### STEAMBOAT INSPECTION SERVICE

The annual amount available for the next fiscal year (1920) for the Steamboat Inspection Service is \$1,114,060, which represents an increase of \$34,000 over the present appropriations and \$5,000 over the Budget estimate. Eleven thousand dollars of this increase is for additional traveling inspectors (three) and the remainder to be used for salary increases for assistant inspectors and clerks in the field.

## BUREAU OF NAVIGATION

We have included in the appropriation for the Bureau of Navigation of \$16,860 for additional commissioners and their clerks and office expenses at Mobile and Los Angeles, where they are very much needed. This makes the total amount available for 1929 \$333,880.

## BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Moderate increases among the various funds of the Bureau of Standards to keep pace with the very valuable and increased work incident to its progress bring the bureau's amount for 1929 up to \$2,246,055. In arriving at this increase a reduction must be taken from the 1928 figures of \$200,000 for a power plant which was authorized during this year and which by its nature is not comparable to the scientific work undertaken and for which appropriations are made.

## BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES

There has been a total increase in the bureau's appropriation included in the bill for the next fiscal year (1929) of \$468,000, bringing the total to \$11,145,250. With the exception of the amount for public works, the appropriations remain practically the same as for 1928. There have been increases of \$9,700 and \$6,300, respectively, in the salaries of employees on Lighthouse Service vessels and Lighthouse Service. For public works, there has been an increase of from \$609,000 to \$1,100,000 for vessels, and a reduction of from \$638,000 to \$622,000 in other works. The distribution of the amounts recommended for public works is as follows:

Item No.	Project	Amount requested	Item No.	Project	Amount requested
1	Vessels.....	\$1,100,000	10	Lansing Shoal.....	\$80,000
2	Hudson River.....	25,000	11	North Manitou Shoal.....	75,000
3	Upper Chesapeake Bay.....	40,000	12	Muskegon.....	37,200
4	Inland Waterway.....	10,000	13	Frankfort.....	4,800
5	Tampa Bay.....	17,000	14	Alaska.....	15,000
6	Southwest Pass.....	45,000	15	Grays Harbor.....	25,000
7	Replacing fog signals.....	40,000	16	Goat Island.....	15,000
8	Straits of Mackinac.....	90,000	17	Santa Barbara.....	5,000
9	St. Marys River.....	25,000	18	Honolulu.....	58,000

The explanation of the 18 items contemplated, amounts for which are shown above, is shown in detail in the hearings before the committee.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey have run along about the same for the past several years, except for several amounts necessary for the construction of vessels, one amount for which, of \$408,000, was contained in the 1928 deficiency act.

## IMMIGRATION SERVICE

Now, I want to say a word to you about the Immigration Service. Your committee this year took a trip around the rim of the United States, visiting our neighbors on the border lines to the north and to the south. Our particular mission was to make a study of the immigration situation. I am pleased to report to the House that we found things almost to our entire satisfaction. The new border patrol, which was created a year or so ago, is a marvelous institution. It is composed largely of ex-service men, men of large experience, brave, fearless, and capable of managing any situation that might be met on the border. They are gentlemen; they are fine-appearing men in uniform; they are sober and honest and industrious; and to my mind they form one of the finest bodies of men that I have seen anywhere. They are scattered all along the border.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. That is in what department?

Mr. SHREVE. The Department of Labor. It is my opinion, and I think the committee will agree with me, that the number of men coming clandestinely over the ocean has been greatly reduced and the men coming across the border to the north and to the south is very small, comparatively. If you take away this patrol, as the Secretary told our committee, the situation would be vastly different. During July and August the border patrol at San Antonio turned back 1,500 people. They had 500 more that they sent to the customs office and to the immigration office. Of course, the number is not so great in other places, but it shows that the patrol is doing the work. We have increased the appropriation; we have increased it for two or three reasons. The first is that these men ought to get better pay, and, secondly, we want to establish a higher class, with greater compensation. We are going to give them a few extra men also.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. The gentleman was out in Minnesota along the main portion of the northern border, but the time at the disposal of the committee would not permit their visiting the Pigeon River station, north of Duluth. It so happened that I spent some time up there and that I know something of the work of the border patrol at the Pigeon River station, which is on the main highway, but with no railroad there at all.

The men are at work there very long hours throughout the entire season, extending through the night. I am glad that provision is made for additional money, because some of these men have had no increase of pay at all, and they rather think they were out so far that the committee had forgotten them, since the committee had visited other points.

Mr. SHREVE. We did not go there because it would have required two more days.

Mr. NEWTON. They made one arrest when I was up there in another part in September, where a man was picked up in the woods about 15 miles from the highway. I may say they are very alert.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I find you have increased the salaries of the higher-grade inspectors. Part of this fund is to be used also to increase the salaries of some of the lower grades?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to call attention to the condition of the men in other grades. I happened to be connected with this service 20 years ago. Some of these men in the lower grades are getting only about \$100 or \$200 a year more than they were getting 20 years ago. They are all specialists in their work, and they are not being paid in commensurate relation to the pay that is given to men in New York City doing similar work. Some of the laborers and employees down there are simply getting starvation wages. It is certainly not becoming for this Government to pay such low wages. I fear that after the \$60,000 increase has been largely expended but little will be left for those of the lower grades.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, we are making just as rapid progress as we can under the limitations imposed upon us. We are doing the best we can.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That may be true, but in the meantime these people have to eat, their children have to be clad, they have to pay rent, and surely we ought to do something for them.

Mr. SHREVE. There is another service in the Bureau of Immigration about which, perhaps, I should say something. We found that the deportation service was only rendering service during eight or nine months of the year. There is a great deal of talk over the country about people who should be sent back. They are here and everywhere, although I am inclined to think there are not as many as it is claimed there are. It is stated there are 100,000 in penal institutions. Many of those would not be subject to deportation. However, we felt inclined to keep that machinery working the whole year around, so we are giving them \$200,000 more to add to their deportation squad. So you may expect that instead of having 12,000 deported during the next year it will be around 14,000 or 15,000.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD. May I ask the gentleman what the average cost is of deporting one of these aliens?

Mr. SHREVE. It is hard to tell, but it runs into considerable money.

Mr. BACHMANN. If the gentleman will permit, Mr. White was before the Immigration Committee this morning, and that same question was asked of him. I think he said that the average cost was about \$87, but to deport to China the highest cost was \$300.

Mr. SHREVE. It runs all the way from \$100 to \$300. There is one more thing I ought to bring to the attention of the House, and that is the helium situation.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Before the gentleman proceeds with that, may I ask a question as to the Mexican border. How well is that guarded, and do we provide any more in this bill for enforcing the immigration law along the Mexican border?

Mr. SHREVE. That is being taken care of in splendid shape. I have just referred to the San Antonio situation down there, and we are strengthening that service wherever it is necessary, but the Mexican border is being taken care of.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. The gentleman believes there are not many crossing the border?

Mr. SHREVE. Not very many. If they get across they are caught. One thousand nine hundred of them in three months were picked up at San Antonio, and then there were 500 more,



making about 2,400 all told. We are perfectly satisfied with the situation on the southern border.

Mr. BACHMANN. I understand that \$200,000 of an increase was asked this year.

Mr. SHREVE. No; we have just given \$200,000 for deportation.

Mr. BACHMANN. How much was requested this year?

Mr. SHREVE. All told, for the Immigration Service a total of \$7,110,000, an increase of \$575,000.

Mr. BACHMANN. There was some discussion before the Immigration Committee along those lines.

Mr. SHREVE. During our hearings an additional or supplemental estimate of \$235,000 was submitted which was granted, making the total increase for 1929 over 1928 \$575,000.

Mr. BACHMANN. So there is an increase this year of about \$200,000?

Mr. SHREVE. No; a total increase, including the supplemental estimate of \$235,000, of \$575,000.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I notice in the hearings an increase of \$207,000 for the construction, repair, and improvement of immigration stations.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. That does not contemplate the building of any stations?

Mr. SHREVE. No; that is to fix up Ellis Island. They have to have some heating work done there; their plumbing is bad, and they have to have some repairs made there. It is principally for Ellis Island.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman know of any survey that has been made for the purpose of determining a uniform type of immigration building to be erected along the borders?

Mr. SHREVE. No; we have not gotten that far along.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to say to the gentleman that along our northern border some one representing some of the departments at Washington appeared this summer to make a survey, and I just wondered under what department that matter would come.

Mr. SHREVE. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. I would like to see the day when we would have a line of Government buildings along the border that would be a credit to this great country of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to inform the gentleman that he has consumed one hour.

Mr. SHREVE. I thank the Chair and I yield myself another hour or so much as is necessary.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to heartily indorse all the gentleman has said with respect to the border patrol. I want to commend the committee for its activity in making a trip along the border, although it had a strenuous day in Vermont.

Mr. SHREVE. We had a very enjoyable day in Vermont, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman tell us as to conditions along the northern border with respect to the enforcement of the immigration law?

Mr. SHREVE. We found conditions along the border, with respect to the enforcement of the immigration law, very satisfactory. There were a few places, perhaps, where the service needed some strengthening. In Buffalo the building of the new Peace Bridge, perhaps, has brought about easy access between the two countries, and it is possible that there we shall have to strengthen it a little; then at Detroit and at one or two other places. But, on the whole, I am very glad to say we are well satisfied with the situation we found.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it not true that the Government is securing the services of high-grade, intelligent men in the enforcement of the immigration and customs law along the northern border?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes; they are the finest kind of men.

Mr. HUDSPETH. May I ask the gentleman how he found conditions on the southern border?

Mr. SHREVE. I am very pleased to say to the gentleman that we found conditions on the southern border very much improved since I was there before, some two years ago.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That has been my observation.

Mr. SHREVE. Really, we were very pleased with the improvement.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am very glad to hear the chairman of the committee make that statement.

Mr. SHREVE. I am not inclined to think any large number of Mexicans are coming across the border down in the gentleman's part of the country.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think so either, I will say to my friend—illegally.

## HELIUM

Mr. SHREVE. I would now like to say a word about helium. This is a subject in which everybody is deeply interested because we supply helium for the Army and the Navy and their consumption now is about 1,000,000 feet a month, which would be 12,000,000 feet a year.

The helium situation may change overnight. You can make a plan for one day and to-morrow you may have to change it. Last year we had the Petrolia field. The Nocono field was a new project which it was pointed out to us would take care of our requirements of helium, and we were asked to authorize the construction of a pipe line. They had a rock pressure up there of 315 pounds. Some new wells were drilled and the gas was piped off in other directions, and the next thing they knew the thing began to fall down and fall down until we found we only had a pressure of 178 pounds, which would not be sufficient to guarantee the building of a pipe line. I am pleased to say that the men in charge over in the Bureau of Mines used their good judgment, and although there was an authorization by Congress to build the pipe line, they did not construct it.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Can the gentleman tell us what progress has been made in the purchase of lands supposed to contain helium?

Mr. SHREVE. I will come to that in a moment.

After they had practically abandoned the Nocono field, they were still operating the Petrolia field, which leads into Fort Worth, and last year they thought this field was about exhausted; but they began to give it some study and working over, and they produced about an average of one-half million feet a month. Sometimes it ran a little over that and sometimes a little less. Now the bureau is working on a new field, with every prospect of success.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. I understand that certain public lands have been reserved because they have helium-bearing gases?

Mr. SHREVE. That is true. The reserves have been set aside with the idea of conserving the rights of the United States in all minerals, but particularly with relation to helium.

Mr. COLTON. Has the committee any information as to the investigations made to determine the extent of this gas on these reserves?

Mr. SHREVE. The Bureau of Mines is working in conjunction with the Geological Survey, and all their test wells and everything are put down at the instance of their advisers. They are working in harmony, but there has been no report made that would answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. COLTON. It would hardly seem necessary or hardly the part of wisdom to go and buy lands until we explore these public lands.

Mr. SHREVE. They do not do that. Nobody in the Government would think of doing that. It is always tested out to the last analysis before anything is bought, and then there is the question of whether they buy any of the land or not. The Government does business just the same as the gentleman would do business or any other business man.

Mr. COLTON. I notice the appropriation for this purpose has been cut down.

Mr. SHREVE. That is because it is not necessary. We are carrying all that is necessary.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. Is the amount of money appropriated for the promotion of mining investigations the amount requested by the Bureau of Mines?

Mr. SHREVE. That is the amount requested. Everybody seems perfectly satisfied, and they are getting along all right with it.

Mr. ARENTZ. And during the current year they have about all they can properly use?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I think this is a very important field.

Mr. SHREVE. Very important.

Mr. ARENTZ. And also the field mentioned by the gentleman from West Virginia, the investigation of falling roofs and of accidents due to bad roofing.

Mr. SHREVE. We gave them a little money to make that study some time ago.

Mr. ARENTZ. There is only about \$20,000 or \$25,000 added to that, I imagine?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. But it is a very important study, because nearly all accidents and casualties come from that cause.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. And the gentleman's committee has increased the amount to be used by the Bureau of Mines for the investigation.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

#### SUBMARINES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the committee, the press of yesterday contained what purported to be an interview with my good friend and colleague from New York, Major LAGUARDIA, in which he is quoted as having used the following language:

I for one will recommend the House of Representatives that it shut up talking about the S-4. I shall recommend that more submarines of that type be built by the Navy as soon as possible.

Not that I think that silence is the proper method of treating the subject when we stand to-day in the shadow of a calamity that is casting a veil of gloom over the entire country, but I do say that it is to be regretted that the gentleman did not follow his own recommendation. For within 24 hours after he gave the interview to the newspaper he took up nearly half an hour on the floor yesterday talking on the very theme he would foreclose to others. The gentleman from New York is original. I like him; he has a charm of personality which makes friends and a brilliant mind which makes him a valuable Member of this House. But since he has undertaken to lecture his colleagues, I feel that the barriers are down and the gentleman must not complain if we come back at him.

He talked for 25 minutes as the defender and apologist of the Navy. That is a new rôle for him, because in my years of experience in this House I think that is the first occasion that he ever took the part of defending anything or anybody. His usual rôle is that of attack, and I want to tell the gentleman that the rôle of attack is better suited to his character. He might have made a better job of his speech if he had tried rather to express the revulsion that perhaps every man in this House and every red-blooded man and woman in the country feel in the shadow of this great calamity.

What prompted this change of rôle? The paper said that he went to Provincetown. Why did he go to Provincetown? To see a reed shaken by the wind? He went there gratuitously to investigate the sinking of the submarine. He confesses that he has no knowledge of the subject. He went there to learn; and think of the school he went to in order to get his information. He went to the men who are largely responsible for the very conditions which brought about this terrible catastrophe.

But, aside from that, I suppose they entertained him nicely and treated him with distinguished consideration. He comes back converted to the methods of the bureaucrats in Washington who have been proclaiming for years that it is impossible to do anything to make submarines safe; that they are essentially war vessels, and that all safety appliances must be subordinated to military uses. The gentleman now tells us on this floor that nothing could be done to save the submarine; that nothing can be done to salvage her; that nothing could have been done by way of appliances or safety devices to prevent this disaster.

Why is he so confirmed in his belief that the Navy has been doing the best thing? Was it because they treated him so nicely? If that is so, he need not be flattered by the distinguished attention he received. That is a common thing with the Navy, nowadays.

They are frantic for experts to confirm their contentions. A couple of weeks ago they entertained a garage keeper with distinguished consideration as "an expert." They found that he had never seen a submarine before his visit to Provincetown. There was an expert, indeed! I am wondering whether my friend and colleague wants to have himself put in that category.

I am reminded of an unpublished stanza of Maud Muller.

I am Captain Jinks of the submarine,  
And aviator in between;  
An admiral I might have been  
If I had joined the Navy.

[Laughter and applause.]

But, aside from his qualifications the gentleman's defense was entirely futile. It answered an indictment that did not exist. It purported to defend the divers and those in charge of the divers at Provincetown who were making such sacrifices in behalf of their fellowmen.

No one, except the Navy bureaucrats, have even remotely intimated that there was any fault to be found with the divers or with the men engaged in salvage operations. Nobody charges them with neglect. They are acting the part of Americans—brave, noble, devoted men—and petty bureaucrats can neither brighten nor tarnish their glory, nor the credit due them by any gratuitous praise which they now belatedly render to them.

Certain swivel-chair men in the Navy Department answered the cry of indignation which swept over the land by sounding the praises of the officers and men engaged in the work of salvage. That, of course, was only drawing a red herring across the trail—an old trick of those whose consciences disturb them. My colleague now takes up the strain—and the joke of it is, that even while he was talking and insisting that the Navy had done everything possible and that there was no need of further investigation, the President's message suggesting an investigation was reposing calmly on the Speaker's desk waiting to be sprung by my good friend, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Has the gentleman observed the attitude of the public mind in this whole situation to be, as we in New York gather it—namely, that there has grown up in our country this bureaucratic crowd, as you call it, in the Navy, as well as the Army, or what somebody has referred to as our militaristic caste in the United States, which has gotten into the habit of treating the American people condescendingly, curtly, and even discourteously, in effect telling them that it is "none of their business" what happens to submarines or other instruments of warfare. In this particular instance of the S-4, this supercilious caste which has grown up in our Army and Navy has gone one step too far. They may hold Congress in disdain, but not the people. When they told the public in a most discourteous manner that it was none of their business what happened to submarines or the lives of our boys in a submarine the public was quick to resent it. A keen observer will now notice that these "superior" persons have drawn into their shells and have somewhat abandoned their patronizing and defiant attitude.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have many intimations from many sources, through a very large correspondence, tending to show that the attitude of the American people is very resentful. The reason for that is that the recent accident to the S-4 was not the first in our Navy. On March 25, 1915, the P-4 sank outside of Honolulu, and 21 brave sailors lost their lives. It took weeks to locate the vessel, and when they found her they fumbled around with all sorts of expedients and experiments in attempts to raise her. Finally, they had to send to San Francisco for pontoons to be made. When they brought the pontoons to Honolulu there were no rings, eyelets, bolts, shackles, or anything on the exterior of the vessel to which the pontoons could be attached. They had to get a diver from New York to travel all of the way to Honolulu, and he, with others, went down to the bottom of the sea and with hydraulic pumps excavated channels underneath the submarine through which to pass the lifting chains. The divers waddled around in the mud and silt for days.

The chains having been pulled up around the submarine and securely fastened, the next arduous and even dangerous task was to sink the pontoons and attach them to the chains. That accomplished, the next step was to pump out the water from the pontoons, in order that they might exert their lifting power to bring the wreck to the surface. The tedious process took months of anxious and arduous labor.

On September 25, 1925, the S-51 went down off Block Island in a collision with the steamship *City of Rome*. The inquiry inevitably arises: Had the Navy done anything in the meantime to make such vessels safe? Had they put either shackles or bolts or eyelets or rings on the surface of the submarines to which pontoons might even be attached? Even if they did feel that it was impossible to lift the submarine from the bottom by a direct lift, did they do anything to expedite and facilitate the attachment of either chains or the pontoons to the submarine? Nothing!

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. In view of the fact that this is an unusually dangerous instrument for the operators, does not the gentleman believe that we might better direct our attention here to trying to bring about an agreement among the nations of the world to outlaw this vicious instrument?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall take that up a little later, if the gentleman will permit. I want to follow out the cause of these accidents and see how far the Navy has gone in the direction of



safeguarding these vessels, or whether they made any effort whatever to make them safe.

My own opinion, answering the question of the gentleman, is that they can be made safe; but the Navy persistently, obstinately, refuses to make them safe, because they are wedded to the notion that they are military devices, and that as military devices life-saving considerations should be made subordinate to their military purpose. Yet I have never heard of any of the admirals who go to sea in battleships or cruisers getting rid of the life rafts, the life preservers, or the radio system, or the oscillators, or the other devices they have to render navigation secure. Why should the submarine be put in this anomalous, peculiar position of being purposely made unsafe?

That is what I am trying to get at—that they are purposely made unsafe. I wonder if it is possible that these Navy gentlemen think as Admiral Melville thought in 1905, that if the submarine is made an effective naval vessel the appropriations for battleships and cruisers and destroyers will cease. Admiral Melville deliberately made that statement in 1907 when he complained that Congress had refused to make appropriations for battleships because in the same session they had made an appropriation for submarines. I wonder if that thought lingers still in their minds.

Take the period between 1915, when the *F-4* sank, and 1925, when the *S-51* sank. Not a blessed thing was done in all those 10 years to render those vessels safe or to safeguard their crews.

My complaint is that they have failed to install the devices which foreign nations have tested and found effective. First of all are the shackles, or rings, or eyelets. I am using many terms to describe what I mean, because the Navy does the same thing. It seems to me there ought to be some way of attaching such devices without interfering with the mobility of the vessel. I am speaking advisedly, because I have letters and personal assurances from men who have been engaged in the construction and operation of submarines. I have here a letter now, and as there is no inhibition against making it public, I will read it:

Please permit me to congratulate you on your sensible and patriotic stand in regard to the investigation of the sinkings of the *S-51* and the *S-4*. Had your very practical suggestions been carried out after the loss of the *S-51* I am sure lives would have been saved in the *S-4*.

There are many safety devices which is possible to incorporate in the present and future designs of submarines at nominal cost.

Who is this man? He tells in the next paragraph. He says:

I speak from experience, as after graduation from the Naval Academy I commanded various naval submarines, and was for a period of five years trial captain for the Lake Torpedo Co. of Bridgeport, Conn. Later I went into commercial salvage work, and when the United States entered the war took command of the salvage steamer *Favorite* to France and was on duty there as the wreck master of the United States naval forces in France.

Anything I can do to further the cause of practical improvement with a view to making impossible a repetition of a disaster like the *S-4*, I will gladly do.

Again assuring you of my admiration for your stand on this matter and with holiday greetings, I am

Respectfully yours,

SLOAN DANENHOWER.

That is an example of scores of letters I have received from men in the service. You will find that although the men are brave and courageous and will take risks, they do most certainly feel that they ought not to be compelled to take risks that are absolutely unnecessary.

Nothing was done between 1915, when the *F-4* was lost, taking a toll of 21 lives, and September 25, 1925, when the *S-51* was sunk, with a toll of 33 lives—a period of 10 years. Why? Because certain men in a certain Navy bureau are wedded to routine and to conservatism. They have never in the last 12 years accepted a suggestion, particularly from the outside, or given a welcome to any proposal to make submarines safe, or to safeguard their crews. They keep up the constant refrain, "It can't be did; it can't be did." Are they katydids? The need of the hour is for men who will not say, "It can't be did," but men who will say, "It can be done."

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Can the gentleman tell us to what extent the submarines of foreign nations employ these safety devices that he mentions?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes. I will go into that directly. In the first instance, there is a safety signal telephone buoy, with

which foreign submarines are equipped, which may be released when the vessel meets with disaster or is upon the bottom, or even for purposes of communication while they are engaged in tests or trials. This buoy, when released, floats to the surface and bobs upon the water. A passing vessel noticing this buoy, which is well known to belong to the Navy, a boat is lowered, an officer goes over, opens it, takes out a telephone and immediately puts himself into communication with the stricken crew.

That is not a new device. It was in use on the *U-3*, the German submarine, which sank in Kiel Harbor January 17, 1911. Her signal buoy was promptly released; a vessel passing noticed it. It was opened; telephone communication was established. They learned that it was the *U-3*, with 27 men and 3 officers on board. Assistance was called and an attempt made to raise her. She was equipped with eyelets. The salvage vessel was unable to make the dead lift, so they compromised by raising one end, and 27 of the crew escaped through the torpedo tube. The officers could have escaped also, but they were wedded to the tradition of their Navy to stick by the ship, and they stuck to their posts. Later on the chain broke which held the submarine in that inclined position and she dropped back, and these heroic officers suffered death at their post of duty.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What depth of water was that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I can not recall the depth.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is very important.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The *S-4*'s length is 231 feet and she sank in 102 feet of water. If we had had adequate devices, such as the Germans seem to have had as far back as 1911, there would have been nothing in the world to prevent hooking chains on to her bow and lifting her, so that the torpedo tube would rise above the surface of the water and allow the men to escape by that means.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has the gentleman figured how much lift it would be?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Well, yes. I note that the gentleman in his remarks yesterday spoke of the *S-4* as weighing 800 tons. Her actual weight is somewhat over 1,000 tons, but in any submarine of this character, divided into compartments, unless all of the compartments are flooded, the net lift is very much lessened.

On the *S-51*, two years ago, they began salvaging operations immediately after she sank. They had to get the pontoons from New York. Why did they not have pontoons at the submarine station where they belonged? They sent divers down who consumed 65 diving days at their work. Doing what? Simply trying to dig holes under the submarine to get chains around it. They finally got chains around it and they sank eight pontoons. The capacity of these pontoons was 80 tons each. Now, if the gentleman will give me his attention, I will explain just what that means. Commander Ellsberg, whose report I have on the salvaging of the *S-51*, reported that there was a net lift on the *S-51* of only 650 tons. A part of her compartments were not filled with water. Now, for 650 tons they used eight pontoons having a lift of 80 tons each.

Nobody can tell me that a lift of 80 tons or even a hundred tons is too great a strain to put upon the hull of a submarine, provided it is properly secured to the frame. There is no use of going into the figures of stress and strain and strength of material, but I will give you one simple illustration. No one would think of throwing the burden of the lift on one grapping ring or eyelet or of putting all the lift of 650 tons, if that is her buoyancy or net lift, on one chain. Common sense dictates that the load be distributed, because distribution of the lift distributes the strain. Therefore put a dozen eyelets on the hull if necessary. It is perfectly practicable to put such a device upon the hull of a submarine. If it is necessary to have her hull like the skin of an eel, inset or countersink the eyelets.

In the case of the *S-51* there was a strain upon each of the chains of only 80 tons. With tackle having the capacity to lift 120 tons, which was within the possibilities, they could very easily, if they had had shackles on the bow of the vessel, have attached them and raised her bow.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, it would be ideal to raise the bow of the vessel, as the gentleman suggests, but has the gentleman taken into consideration the depth of water in which the hull is now as well as the pull necessary to raise the bow of the vessel?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have gone into that very thing.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If that is so, what derrick is there in this country that could have done it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is just the thing in a nutshell. The gentleman talks of derricks! Did you see the pictures in the paper of the derricks they brought out there to salvage this submarine? Flat hulks with derricks on them; they are a disgrace to any navy that uses such obsolete methods. Why did they not have salvage vessels? What has the Navy ever done to recommend the building of salvage vessels? Nothing! I besought them two years ago, when the *S-51* was wrecked, to request Congress to authorize the construction of salvage vessels such as are used in foreign navies.

Now, what are these salvage vessels? They are simply big hulks of catamarans with tremendous displacement, sufficient to lift any submarine that has ever been built or will be built for some years to come—with cranes and all the apparatus necessary to distribute the weight on the different parts, so that it would be perfectly possible to lift a submarine if it had shackles attached to its hull, or even shackles or eyelets to which pontoons could be quickly attached. Is that a dream? Is that my imagination? Germany has the *Vulcan*. France has another salvage ship of that kind. Italy has the largest of them all, and I am sure would have been glad to have loaned it to us in our trouble. What a shame that we should at this good hour and in this civilized day be compelled to confess our inadequacy and our inefficiency where human life is at stake!

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe the *Vulcan* could have lifted the *S-4*?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No; but she could easily have lifted one end of her, the same as she did with the *U-3*.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But the *U-3* was a very much smaller boat and was in much shallower water, and that makes a lot of difference.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The depth was not of so much consequence—the net lift was only a couple of hundred tons.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But it was not in 100 feet of water, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GRIFFIN. What is the use of arguing those things. I do not happen to know the exact depth and neither does he. I can only say where there is a will there is a way. If a submarine sinks in a depth where one end of her can be brought to the surface, there ought to be vessels large enough, big enough, and with appliances strong enough to at least lift one end. I am modest and that is all I am asking.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe such a vessel could be lifted at a depth of 400 feet?

Mr. GRIFFIN. They have not sunk as yet in 400 feet.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. But the ocean is more than 400 feet.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That leads to another question. If any should happen to sink in a place where such an ocean depth prevails, there would be no hope unless there were means of escape for the crew before the vessel reached that depth. That has its possibilities, too. But we are now speaking of the accidents with which we have so far had experience—the *S-51*, which sunk in 134 feet of water, and the *S-4*, which sunk in 104 feet of water.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I do not think the gentleman has told us whether or not the German submarine *U-3* had a hook or shackle on it?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; she did—a number of them.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. And that is the way they did lift it?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROMJUE. Can the gentleman state how far the vessel was from the coast at the point where it sank? I believe it was in 104 feet of water, but how far was it from the coast at Provincetown?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not know the exact distance, but it seemed to me from looking at the map that it must have been about a mile or mile and a half.

Mr. ROMJUE. From the pictures I noticed in the papers it was apparently very close.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Do I understand that the gentleman brought to the attention of the Navy Department the feasibility or the advisability of installing these devices and they turned the gentleman down?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Absolutely.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. When?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Oh, repeatedly; for instance, in my speech in the House here two years ago. That was public notice to everybody and the department knew about it.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. It seems inconceivable they should not have brains enough to employ these devices.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Remember, too, that I am only speaking of well-known devices that are in use in foreign navies. In addition to the grappling rings or eyelets, there is the signal buoy and there is the smoke bomb to indicate when a vessel is about to arise.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I have an indistinct recollection of one of the Japanese submarines being sunk rather recently; has the gentleman any information about that?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. How many lives were lost on that submarine?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wonder if I would be warranted in asking a little more time, as there seems to be much interest in this matter.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to know in this connection, while the gentleman has the floor, why that vessel was not raised and whether or not they had the safety devices that the gentleman speaks about.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Japanese have had three notable accidents beginning with April 15, 1910, when the submarine *6* sank, owing to a defective valve, and 14 lives were lost. On August 21, 1923, the submarine *70* of the Japanese Navy sank at Kobe base, Japan, and the cause was unknown. The death list was 85 men. On March 19, 1924, the Japanese submarine *43* sank after a collision, and 49 lives were lost.

Mr. DENISON. I am just wondering if there is a bureaucratic condition there which is responsible for that condition or whether they have these safety devices.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I never went into that. I have been so busy worrying about keeping our own house in order that I have never bothered with the Japanese problem.

I see I can not make headway consecutively. I did not anticipate talking so long on this subject; but I prepared an agenda for the consideration of the commission that I hope will be appointed pursuant to the President's suggestion.

I put in a resolution the day after the vessel sank asking for a special committee to consist of seven Members of this House, to investigate the disaster and to study the question of safety devices. I am glad the President has sent his message and has suggested the appointment of this commission. This indicates he has an interest in the subject, but my only regret is that he did not do this two years ago after the sinking of the *S-51*. I introduced my resolution then calling for this investigation and it has lain dormant and neglected. I reintroduced it the other day when the *S-4* sank, and I still believe that an investigation by the membership of this House, sitting as a jury, where the experts could be heard and cross-examined would be a better way of learning the truth than to rely on any expert commission that might have a reason, through their Navy connection, to hide the true facts—in short, I think it would be much better to have us sit here and bring the experts to the Capitol instead of being obliged to await their pleasure in reaching their conclusion. I think we can rely upon the intelligence of this House to determine, when we get the facts, whether a certain thing is right or wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon his presentation of this very interesting and important subject and also to commend him for his promptness in calling it to the attention of the House immediately after the accident. In connection with the gentleman's statement that the President has requested an investigation, I am wondering if the gentleman noticed in this morning's Washington Post a paragraph from the pen of George Rothwell Brown, which says:

It won't, I am sure, create any surprise that the President requests an investigation of the *S-4* disaster, as it was plain to all eyes that Congress was going to insist on having one. The great knack in leadership is in knowing which street the parade is going to turn down.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I was going to go into the matter of the agenda for the commission, and my reason for bringing it up now is to indicate the avenues of research and the devices which are feasible and which have been tried out, as well as to indicate to the House that certain parties have been derelict in not having installed these devices. I may be somewhat premature, but here is my idea as to the scope of the inquiry:



## AGENDA

(For the S-4 commission)

1. Was the S-4 equipped with an oscillator and auditory diaphragm to signal and receive signals and sounds of vessels moving in the vicinity?
2. Was this device in good condition?
3. Was it manned at the time of the accident?
4. Has the Navy Department issued any orders requiring a member of the crew of the submarine to be always on duty at this device while the vessel is submerged?
5. What orders of the Navy Department have been issued, if any, with respect to the attendance of a warning escort vessel while a submarine is navigating submerged?
6. What has become of the order of the Hon. Franklin Roosevelt, former Secretary of the Navy, respecting the installation of signal smoke bombs intended to warn shipping that a submarine is about to rise to the surface?
7. Were any such devices ever installed?
8. What is the status of the telephone signal buoy? Why were they removed and why have they not been restored?
9. What steps have been taken to install air inlets giving direct communication to each compartment of the submarine?
10. Why have not grappling rings, hooks, eyelets, or shackles been installed on submarines to facilitate their prompt raising either by pontoons or direct lifting tackle?
11. Why were not pontoons kept at the submarine base in the vicinity of the scene of submarine submerging practice?
12. What steps have been taken by the Navy to design appropriate salvage vessels equipped with all modern devices for prompt salvage of submarines in distress?
13. What steps have been taken by the Navy to study the operation of a certain diving suit devised in Germany and adopted by the navies of Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Spain?
14. What steps have been taken by the Navy to provide an airlock escape chamber or a diving chamber such as is used in certain types of submarines?
15. Why can not such a submarine be employed in salvage operations where the divers can work on the sea bottom without disturbance from either wind or rain?
16. What steps have been taken by the Navy to install automatic double swing doors between the compartments of the submarine?

I am sure that if the commission digs into these matters it will make recommendations that will forever preclude the recurrence of such disasters as this, which shocked the Nation and the world.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 483) entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KEYES, Mr. WARREN, Mr. FESS, Mr. REED of Missouri, and Mr. ASHURST to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The committee resumed its session.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1929

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make a statement at this time, and am now only led to do so in order to correct what might be construed as an indictment against the entire personnel of the Navy.

I am in accord with the commendable interest shown by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] to provide submarines with proper and adequate safety devices, also to provide funds for adequate salvage equipment that will aid in the prevention of loss of life and property resulting from disasters.

Since investigations have been ordered by the House of the sinking of the S-4, and full information will later be placed before the House relative to this matter, it occurs to me that all improvident statements should be avoided at this time. While I would not charge that the gentleman from New York has uttered any improvident statement in so far as showing interest in providing salvage and safety appliances for the Navy, yet when he undertakes to refer to "a bureaucracy" and impliedly to charge that the Navy as a whole is responsible for what he considers to be mistakes and omissions involving culpable negligence, I respectfully submit that his indictment is too broad.

There are only a very few officers of the Navy to whom have been assigned in the past the work of constructing and designing submarines. The great number of naval officers could not in any way be held responsible for any mistakes or omissions that may have occurred relative to submarines.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will say that I am very glad that the gentleman has modified my statement in that way, because I had in mind to qualify it myself. But I was indulging in a figure of speech when I said that the Navy as a whole was responsible. I am placing my condemnation on the men of the Navy who are responsible for the backward policy, and I think the gentleman knows that I did not mean to assail the Secretary of the Navy or the Admirals who are not responsible.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That correction is in keeping with the accustomed fairness of the gentleman from New York, and I was sure that he had no desire to do injustice to a great service. No one would insist that the Navy has never made mistakes in the past. What service, whether we call it Government service or not, has not made mistakes? It is not unusual when any great catastrophe happens to hear the suggestion that adequate provision could and should have been made to avoid such a disaster. This has been said in reference to the great overflow of last year which resulted in the loss of many lives.

I feel that the inquiries which the House has already set in motion will later disclose who, if any, are to blame for not having provided safety devices for our submarines and better salvage equipment. Then again, the investigation will likely lead to another important step by placing the designing and construction of submarines in future under the control and direction of those officers of the Navy who have to man them and have manned them, and who are best qualified to correct mistakes in design or construction.

I am frank to say I have felt that perhaps in reference to the designing and construction of submarines we have not always given to that service the aid of those officers best qualified to perform this work. [Applause.] What we have done in reference to aircraft should be done in reference to submarines.

Now, in conclusion, I feel sure that my friend from New York will not take issue with me when I say that the personnel of the Navy, both officer and enlisted, in patriotism, ability, skill, courage, human sympathy, and human kindness are not surpassed by any like body of men. [Applause.] If mistakes have been made and it required a great disaster to accentuate them, we can feel assured that an intelligent effort will be made to do the things that should now be done in order to conserve human life when disasters come. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the difference between my colleague from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] and myself is that I know that I am not an expert upon submarines. After his criticism and mild rebuke directed toward me for going up to Provincetown and looking around, I think this House was entitled to a more constructive and surely more accurate information on the subject from the submarine expert. As to my being lavishly entertained, let me tell the gentleman that if he will try 36 hours on a submarine in the North Atlantic on a cold January night, he will disabuse his mind of any elaborate entertainment. I had one meal with the crew, and the rest were four meals at 24 cents apiece. If going to the spot and talking with men who do know their business was the wrong thing for a Member to do, I plead guilty.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not now. I shall yield to the self-appointed leader of the Tammany delegation in this House in a moment. It is true, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] says, that I have criticized the Navy in the past, and that in most instances I have assumed the attitude of attack on the floor of the House, but I have never once come before this House unless I knew what I was talking about, and I would not come before this House with any suggestions of lifting boats from the bottom of the ocean unless I knew something of the size, dimension, and structure of the boat, and unless I thoroughly understood the physics and mechanics involved in such an undertaking, which the gentleman has entirely ignored or overlooked in his suggestions of salvaging submarines, and I have never made such a childish, stupid, silly, unworthy charge as to say that the officers of the Navy have purposely made the submarines unsafe.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Why, they say that themselves.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That they have purposely made the submarine unsafe?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman has never heard a Navy officer say that in his life. It is ridiculous to say that officers of the Navy Department have purposely made unsafe their own vessels, in which they are bound to go from time to time, and to which their own comrades, classmates, and in many instances their sons are assigned.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Has not the gentleman seen the quotation in the newspaper recently, the authorship of which I think is by the head of the Bureau of Navigation and Construction, a certain Captain Rock, in which he says that these submarines are military vessels and that safety devices are not considered to be essential; that all safety devices must be subordinated to their military purpose?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Oh, that is entirely different from saying that the vessel is made purposely unsafe. That statement indicated that the function and particular service and purpose of a ship were the essentials. It is the same in aviation. A pursuit plane has a factor of safety of 3 to 1, while a passenger plane has a factor of safety of 6 or 7 to 1. A passenger plane has a gliding angle of about 5 to 1, while a pursuit plane has a gliding angle of 2 or 3 to 1. You must take into consideration the purpose for which the plane or the vessel is made. A submarine must submerge and must have speed. If we attach a lot of spangles and fangles to it so that it loses its necessary qualities then there is no purpose in having such a vessel.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am glad to see that the gentleman has gotten back to the airplane.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes. At least I know something about that, and that is more than I can say of the gentleman with respect to the submarine. The gentleman compares the submarine U-3, which sank in the Kiel Harbor, with the S-51 and the S-4, but in reply to my inquiry he says that he does not know at what depth of water the U-3 sank. If the gentleman ignores the depth in which the vessel sinks, and seeks to make a comparison between a vessel in 40 feet of water and a vessel in 100 feet of water, then I submit to an elementary school class in physics whether or not such a comparison is of any value. Besides, this German U-boat was a much smaller craft. Besides, the compartments in this U-boat were not all flooded with water. That is why it was possible to lift one end of it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Just one moment. Does the gentleman state that the U-3 sank in 40 feet of water?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will say that it sank in 50 feet less of water than the S-4.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is that a guess or it is an actual fact?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman knows, or he ought to know, because he made the comparison and he has just lifted the S-4 out of the water, just a few moments ago. He described how the German U-boat was lifted out, but he ignores entirely the conditions. The gentleman then says that he is going to apply shackles and eyelets and rings to submarines, and is going to lift them out under all circumstances, and when he is asked what he is going to do if it sinks in 300 feet of water, or 400 feet of water, he has no reply. Gentlemen, if a submarine sinks in 300 or 400 feet of water there is absolutely nothing that can be done. Divers can not work at that depth and therefore all the rings and hooks and eyelets would be of no avail. It so happened that the S-4 and the S-51 sank in comparatively shallow water. As long as we have navigation on the sea or under the sea or in the air, if my colleague from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] will permit me again to refer to the air, accidents will happen. And again I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] that he entirely overlooks the possibility of lifting eight hundred or a thousand tons out of a hundred feet of water. His own suggestion of having these hooks and rings and eyelets and shackles is for the purpose of making quick attachment and lifting the vessel out of the water. As I have already said, no one derrick or crane could do it. A crane or derrick with a lift of 200 tons would require an enormous float sufficient to carry it and stand the strain of such a lift. To get sufficient such floats at one spot they could hardly get close enough to the submerged body to effect a uniform lift. When the gentleman refers to pontoons, then, of course, so much time is required to get the pontoons to the site of the accident, to sink them, to blow the water out that all hope of completing such operations within time to save life in a submarine is entirely lost. Therefore, if the pontoons are the only method known at this time to lift a submarine and it being necessary for divers to go down to attach these submarines, all of which require several diving days, it is clear that hooks and rings and shackles and eyelets

are not the solution. A submarine is a mass of intricate heavy machinery in a light hull. A ring or eyelet can not be attached simply to the hull of the vessel. Such an attachment would tear out the minute it is put under the strain of a pull. To apply these rings to large submarines would require an entirely new structure of the ship, and this at the cost of weight, space, speed, and a submarine at the present stage of the art has no such space or weight to spare. All of these matters have been under consideration and study for years.

The gentleman from New York referred to Commander Ellsberg, and I am sure that Commander Ellsberg will inform him that everything humanly possible was done for the S-4.

The gentleman from New York talks about the telephone buoy. Very well. You can use such appliances only under ideal conditions. The U-3 to which the gentleman refers was not sunk as the result of a collision as in the case of the S-4 and the S-51. Here we had a terrific collision. In one case by a large passenger boat, the *City of Rome*, and in this particular case by a large Coast Guard cutter steaming at 18 knots, and in such cases every appliance on board is put out of commission. We saw that in the ballast tank air tubes and in the compartment air tubes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the S-4 and the S-51 did have this telephone buoy?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No. I said that if it did have it, in all likelihood it would have been put out of commission. Besides, in the case of the S-4, as in the case of the S-51, there was no need of the telephone buoy, for the reason that the spot of the collision was known, and in the case of the S-4 communication was actually established with those still alive on board. And I must say again if a vessel sinks in very deep water such a signal or such communication is of no avail. Of course, if a suitable indicating and communicating buoy can be applied to a submarine and is of sufficient value to warrant its application, submarines should have them, but that is a matter for the experts to work out, and to date no such appliance has been perfected to that degree of accuracy and usefulness as to warrant censure for their absence on our vessels.

Now, we did have rings and shackles and eyelets on the smaller Holland boats, but they were of no avail and will be of no avail when the gentleman attaches his eyelets and rings and shackles on a boat and says he is going to send a derrick there to lift it. But he has not constructed that derrick yet. Does the gentleman know that the biggest derrick and crane on land in this country can lift no more than 200 tons? How is the gentleman going to build a derrick and float it and go out and lift a ship of 800 tons?

Mr. GRIFFIN. You do not need a derrick.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. How are you going to lift the ship?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman does not know?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I know he does not know. That is just the point. You can not have a tender, a derrick, and a salvage boat following every submarine. It is just as easy to require a squad of firemen to run under every aviator and catch him in a net if he falls down.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I would rather not.

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Very well; go on.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not reasonable to expect that in making the trial trip of a submarine, where the submarine is submerged and where one trial trip is following another, when one is completing a mile trial trip, that we should send a tender out to let other ships know where the submarine is? Is it not reasonable?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That has nothing to do with this argument. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] bases his whole argument that we should have a—

Mr. BLANTON. When we were expecting the landing in Paris of Colonel Lindbergh that night no airship could fly in Washington except one, and that one was to notify the people here that afternoon of his safe arrival. That was a sane regulation. The Navy should have exercised not ordinary care, but the highest degree of care, in sending a tender over this mile course.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's statement was rather remarkable.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not believe you are going to train men to maneuver a submarine if you are to have an escort to every submarine, because the presence of an escort destroys the very function of the submarine.

Mr. BLANTON. On a mile trial?



Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not practicable with a submarine.

Mr. BLANTON. The ship that struck the submarine had no knowledge of the submerged craft. They should have had knowledge that the other was there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That course was marked. There is a mark there that is used for that purpose, and that is notice to all navigators to look out for submarines at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As to escort ships or warning ships to follow submarines the general consensus of opinion of submarine officers is that it is not necessary and of no service. In fact, Lieut. Frank Worden, who commands the S-8 and who has been in command and in the submarine service for several years and knows his job, goes further and says that such a ship would be a source of annoyance to the submarine. I want to say in passing that Lieut. Frank Worden was on the job a few hours after the accident, remained on constant duty without getting any sleep for days and days, and when he talks about submarines he knows what he is talking about. This gallant young officer hails from the State of Montana and was appointed several years ago to the Naval Academy by our colleague the gentleman from Montana, Mr. EVANS. I want to congratulate Mr. EVANS on his choice and appointment of this splendid young officer. Now, this is what Lieutenant Worden says about an accompanying or warning ship to follow a submarine:

It would be just one more vessel to watch. As we were maneuvering it would be necessary to have the tender keep clear. I do not consider the presence of a tender necessarily desirable. No surface craft interfered with the S-8 during her tests. When they saw the periscopes they got out of the way.

What I reiterate now and what I said yesterday is that when a vessel sinks in deep water it creates a difficult problem involving many factors. When you have two vessels colliding with terrific force you have everything on board of the ship thrown out of gear. The question of rings and eyelets and shackles has been considered by the Navy Department. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] does not contend that it is his invention. Such a device has been used on small vessels, on submarines, but not on large vessels. No matter what salvage conditions you create, you can not salvage a ship in 300 or 400 feet of water, no matter what you do, even with pontoons. Pontoons are large, heavy, and clumsy and cumbersome. You can not have pontoons and salvage ships following every submarine. Assuming that you have eyelets and rings and shackles, it takes time to put those pontoons down, and you have to send divers down, and all that is a matter that can not be done within 60 days.

I think I have been fair in my criticisms on the floor of the House, and I repeat what I said the other day, that the Navy did in this instance all that was humanly possible; and I say again, as I said before, that it is easier to salvage a ship in the quiet of the House Office Building on paper, disregarding all matters of physics, weather, sea, mechanics, and equipment, than it is to do it on the spot under a hundred feet of water. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

#### NICARAGUA

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, following on the success of the American Revolution, the ferment of republicanism penetrated throughout the world. Kings shook on their thrones. Emperors and potentates trembled for their systems. France was the first to follow the example of the United States by overthrowing the Bourbons under Louis XVI. The Napoleonic wars were in a large measure the reflex of the shock which ensued, and were in their essential aspects the result of the efforts of the monarchs of Europe to defend their governmental systems.

Kings reigning by virtue of "divine right" felt that it was necessary that they do something to stamp out the republican spirit. They trembled for the traditions of monarchical govern-

ment. There was conflict through the world between the spirit of republicanism and the monarchical system. Following the example of the United States, the Spanish-American colonies one by one had asserted their independence of Spain and she was being driven from the New World. At that juncture, in 1815, the "Holy Alliance" between the rulers of Austria, Prussia, and Russia came into being. Its essential purpose was to defend the monarchical system against the spirit of republicanism. It was the answer of "divine right" to the ferment of republicanism.

#### THE PURPOSE OF THE HOLY ALLIANCE

The Holy Alliance as a part of its program planned to restore the power of Spain in the New World and to again subject those colonies which had achieved their independence to the dominion of the King of Spain. It was also designed that new provinces and realms of power within the New World should be marked off to European sovereigns. In that sense the Holy Alliance was a threat to American independence.

As an answer to that threat and in order to clear the situation, Mr. Monroe enunciated the principle which has come to be known as the "Monroe doctrine." It was, in substance, that the United States would regard any attempt upon the part of the European governments to extend the monarchical system into the Western Hemisphere as an act of unfriendliness to the American Government. That is all the Monroe doctrine was at its beginning. It was merely an answer to the Holy Alliance. It confined itself to the principle that an attempt to extend monarchical systems of government in the Western Hemisphere was inconsistent with American interests; by its implication it extended merely to matters of sovereignty so far as American countries were concerned. It held, in short, that no European monarchy would be permitted to bring additional territory on the Western Hemisphere under its dominion nor to create upon the Western Hemisphere any new monarchical system.

It was not intended to interfere with existing situations. It did not challenge the dominion which Great Britain had over the islands of the West Indies as well as portions of South America and of Canada, nor the control which various European countries had over territory in the Western Hemisphere. It was confined solely to new situations and new attempts to extend monarchical systems and control over territory on this side.

#### MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT MONROE

The Monroe doctrine had its expression in President Monroe's message to Congress submitted on December 2, 1823. Russia was asserting claims upon Alaska and other territory in that part of the continent. Referring to these claims, President Monroe said:

In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

In referring to conditions among the new Latin American Republics of South America, he said:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

In these paragraphs was expressed all of the Monroe doctrine. One of its chief purposes was the protection of the new Latin American Republics. Of course, neither Monroe nor anyone of his time ever dreamed that it would ever be argued that the United States was assuming the duty of pacification, preserving public order, and policing our neighbor nations, nor of collecting foreign and American debts from them.

The Monroe doctrine recognized the full sovereignty of each of the Latin-American countries, and the full political equality of each of them with the United States. It claimed no superiority nor overlordship for ourselves, nor any greater right in any of the other countries than they had in our own. It claimed for the United States no right whatever to meddle with the internal

affairs of our sister Republics. To the contrary, it was an assertion of their right to govern themselves, free from interference from European monarchies, as well as from ourselves.

—It ought to be unnecessary to argue to intelligent and candid men that we have no more right nor authority under the Monroe doctrine to violate the territory or the sovereignty of a Latin-American Republic than we would have in the case of a European or Asiatic country. It was intended as a bulwark for the protection of our sister Republics, and not as an engine for their oppression.

#### WHAT MONROE DOCTRINE IS

No respectable authority has ever claimed that the Monroe doctrine conferred upon the United States any rights whatsoever. It was merely a declaration of our national policy, and has, of course, never attained the dignity of a rule of international law. Under it we owe no duty to take any action inconsistent with our national interests. We do not need to insist upon the doctrine longer than it suits our policy to do so, but many abandon it at any time without any breach of faith with other nations. Under it we owe no duty to protect the nationals or property or interests of European nations which may be jeopardized by a South American revolution. For all such we may remit the complainants to the assertion of their rights under the recognized principles of international law. European governments have the same rights under international law, with reference to South American Republics, as to other countries of the world. It gives the United States no protectorate over Central and South American Republics, nor duty to defend them from attack, and none to answer for their shortcomings.

—The Latin-American Republics may go to war with each other or with nations of Europe or elsewhere without giving us cause to intervene. They are as completely sovereign and independent as we ourselves. The doctrine merely announces for us that we will not permit nations of the Eastern Hemisphere to encroach upon the sovereignty or territory of other American nations.

The meaning of the Monroe doctrine, as recently set forth by Secretary Hughes, is as follows:

Properly understood, it is opposed (1) to any un-American action encroaching upon the political independence of American states under any guise, and (2) to the acquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in this hemisphere by any un-American power.

Considering the intent of the message, and that it has been, and must be, interpreted in the light of changing circumstances and conditions, I do not believe that the correctness of Mr. Hughes's definition can be disputed.

#### ATTEMPTS TO EXPAND AND DISTORT DOCTRINE

Many attempts have been made to expand the Monroe doctrine, to contort it, and to twist it. It is important, in order to understand the persistency of these attempts, that we should recognize just what is back of them. It is necessary to recognize the fact that there are those here in our own country and among our own citizens who do not accept in their full implications the doctrines of republicanism and of democratic self-government. America has her fascists as well as Italy.

It is a common belief that all Americans were unanimous in their desire for independence. This is a grave error. It is a fact that a very influential element of our people were loyal to the British Crown and had no desire to change our political system, and had no wish to break the ties which bound them to the Old World. They did not believe in republicanism nor in self-government.

Many of these Loyalists and Tories were driven out as the Revolution went on. I wish that all might have gone and that they might have remained away. Unfortunately many of them came back when the war was ended. The strangest development in all American political history is that within 20 years after the close of the Revolution the same Tory elements which had opposed independence were found contending for political control against those who had won independence. That struggle between Tory elements, those who believed in caste and privilege, those who held that a small superior class should be developed which should ride at ease upon the shoulders of the masses—the struggle between the Tories, their political descendants the Federalists, and the modern school of the same political faith, on the one hand, and those who believed in real democracy, on the other, has come down to us to this day. That struggle between Toryism and Americanism is as acute to-day as it has ever been in the past. Much of the time the Tory elements have been in control of our Government. May I make what I mean perfectly clear by saying that in my judgment they are in control now. [Applause.]

#### WHAT THE TORIES ARE TRYING TO DO

The effort has been made to twist and contort the Monroe doctrine into an instrument which shall serve the will of the Tories, who do not believe in democracy—to serve their will in their efforts to mark off the Western Hemisphere as territory belonging exclusively to us, so that it shall be the field for our exclusive exploitation, and in which we shall expand as we may find it convenient and safe to do so. They dream dreams of world power; they think of imperial Rome and would make America into a new Rome. They think of South America not as a collection of independent nations, entitled under our own principles to enjoy the right of self-government; to the contrary, they think of South America as an appendage of the United States. It is their conscious design, so far as they have a consciousness, little by little and time by time as they may be able to digest them, to swallow up and absorb the South American countries, so that our flag may float from pole to pole.

That is their degraded idea of America's future. They would absorb these weak countries without their consent; they would take them through our military power and through the might of the strong arm.

In the meantime they choose to regard Central and South America as a field in which our business men and financiers shall enjoy special and exclusive rights and privileges. There they shall have exclusive advantages of trade; they shall have concessions for opening mines, digging harbors, constructing railroads, and making loans; it shall be the happy hunting ground of the American manufacturer and trader, and of the American financier and international banker, and the tolling millions of Central and South America shall exist not upon terms of equality with us but as servile populations, to be exploited for our economic benefit.

#### THE SHADOW OF IMPERIALISM

It is necessary to get this picture in our minds in order to understand the efforts which the Tories have made to expand and extend and contort and twist the Monroe doctrine until finally it shall be converted into such an instrument that it will serve them in the purposes which they have in their hearts. There are the principles of imperialism. There is the doctrine which the nations of the Old World have applied in their own peculiar spheres of influence. Under its influence the British flag floats over India and over many other portions of the world; under it France holds her territory in Africa, Asia Minor, and China, and so on and on and on.

Because of the clash of interests between the great imperialistic and exploiting nations the world had the recent terrible war. With all the folly of man apparently we have learned nothing from its horrors and are now preparing the way for another war based upon cold commercial considerations, and a desire to get control of more territory that we may exploit it and make money out of it and grow rich and powerful out of it.

It is to combat this awful thought, to combat these dreadful schemes that I feel such a great interest in the developments which are taking place to-day in Nicaragua.

I hear gentlemen speak of the "right" of one nation to land troops upon the soil of another nation for the protection of the lives and property of its nationals. There is no such right. International law knows of no such thing. It is not a "right," it is merely a practice. It is a practice indulged in only by those who are strong enough to be able to do so with safety to themselves; only by those who are powerful enough to be able to violate the territory of another nation without fear of adequate rebuff and reprisal. It is the practice followed by the great and powerful nations in dealing with those who are weak and poor and subject to them.

Within the history of the world, in either ancient or modern times, no nation of first rank has ever submitted to the assertion of any such right within its territory upon the part of any other nation whatsoever. When I hear men talk of such "rights" I recognize that they are lacking either in information or in candor.

There is no such "right." It is a "practice," I admit. Whether a justifiable practice each particular case must stand on its own merits and it is not possible to condemn it by wholesale. Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that having accomplished the protection of its nationals and of their property, no one has ever been so rash and regardless of logic and consistency as to say that a nation may go further, and after having protected the lives and property of its nationals, go on and remain indefinitely in the country whose sovereignty has been infringed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.



Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

PRESIDENT CARRYING ON AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL WAR

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We entered Nicaragua upon the pretended purpose of protecting the lives and property of American citizens. Having accomplished this purpose, there was no excuse, either under international law or international practice, honesty, or good faith, for remaining there. There is no pretense we are there now protecting American lives and property. Nobody argues this. Even the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] has not the temerity to take such a position.

What are we doing in Nicaragua? We are carrying out an agreement made by Mr. Stimson with leaders of the two Nicaraguan factions. And who was Mr. Stimson? He was the extrajudicial, or, to put it in plain words, the illegal representative of the President of the United States—his personal representative there. He made a trade with the various elements in Nicaragua. Whether honest or otherwise, it is immaterial for the purposes of this speech. He made this trade, and now American boys are fighting and laying down their lives—to defend America? To defend American rights under international law? To defend American property and protect American lives? No; to carry out the trade that Mr. Stimson made.

And since when, I ask, has Stimson, the President, or anybody else had the right without the consent of the Congress of the United States to enter into any obligation which binds us to keep our soldiers upon foreign soil? [Applause.]

The action of our administration in keeping marines in Nicaragua and in carrying on this wild adventure is illegal, even as a matter of technicality; in effect and reality it is violative of the very fundamentals of Americanism; it is unconstitutional. Men have been called from office for smaller offenses. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think 5 minutes is entirely too much time to take in answering the substance of the last speech of 20 minutes. The statement was made that the gentleman from Ohio would not have the temerity to make the statement that the marines are in Nicaragua for the purpose of protecting life and property.

Mr. TUCKER. American life and property.

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. TUCKER. Now.

Mr. BEGG. Now. I will cite the gentleman to the special communication of President Coolidge in the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, in which he not only makes the flat statement that repeatedly were requests made from American nationals direct to the Government, but to the American representative in Nicaragua, for protection of both life and property, and that the chargé d'affaires of Great Britain at Managua made representations that they wanted the United States to protect the nationals and the property of Great Britain.

The ambassador of Italy in the city of Washington made the same character of representations to the State Department in Washington, and if that statement is not accurate, then the message of the President on Nicaragua is wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the last message of the President?

Mr. BEGG (continuing). And if that statement is accurate, I come right back to my principle announced yesterday and ask you where is the man that is willing to take the position that the Monroe doctrine no longer shall be enforced?

Where is the man who is willing to say we will not protect the nationals of Great Britain and Italy or support the Monroe doctrine? Where is the man, I ask again, that is so unresponsive to these basic principles of patriotism that moved the spirit of every man of the time to which the gentleman refers—the Revolutionary period—when the Monroe doctrine was called into force, as to say he will disregard the rights and lives of the American citizens in foreign territory?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How long would the gentleman have us remain there?

Mr. BEGG. That is an easy thing—if I had absolute control they would remain there just as long as was required to establish a stable, responsible government in Nicaragua. [Applause.]

Certainly, gentlemen, the United States would never violate the sacred territory of any nation having a responsible government; but when the President of Nicaragua, as admitted by the gentleman's own side, has been constitutionally and legally elected as first designate in Nicaragua, when he requests

the support of some outside power—what for? To maintain peace and preserve life. No one would refuse that aid that means so much to suffering humanity.

Instead of waging a war, we should be deemed missionaries of peace. If it is wrong to help the irresponsible, chaotic nation of Nicaragua to gain a place among the nations of the world, until they can guide their own ship of state, it is just as wrong for the Christian church to send missionaries to the heathen. There is no difference whatever. It is only carrying the benefits of Christian civilization in the way of stability to a government so they can not only protect the lives of the nationals of other countries, but their own people as well from the assaults of the bandit tribes. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the American Mining Congress met in this city in December. I have some mining in my district, and they have passed resolutions which I desire to extend in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I wish them to appear in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by embodying certain resolutions as a part of the extension of his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is quite an extensive zinc field in my district. I desire to give due publicity to the matter which follows:

Important strides in development of mineral resources of the South are expected to follow recent action of the American Mining Congress. At its convention here early in December this organization adopted a resolution calling the attention of mining developers to the possibility of engaging in profitable production of southern minerals. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas it is the steadfast purpose of the American Mining Congress to stimulate development of mineral resources and to promote the welfare of the mining industry of the United States; and

Whereas this organization has, during recent years made investigations of southern mineral resources and has found that in States in the South there are valuable deposits of zinc, lead, manganese, bauxite, kaolin, marble, clays, and other useful minerals in commercial quantities that are susceptible of economic mining: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body earnestly commends the undeveloped fields in the South to the favorable consideration of the mining industry of the Nation to the end that home industries may be fostered and have precedence over foreign fields in supplying minerals for American needs in commerce and industry.

The resolution was brought forward by Judge J. H. Hand, of Yellville, Ark., a resident of my district. He is a member of the Arkansas Department of Mines, and of the board of governors of the southern division of the American Mining Congress. When Judge Hand laid the matter before a meeting of the board of governors it was unanimously approved and he was authorized to present the resolution to the convention. It is expected that added impetus will be given to the movement at the annual Southern Industrial Development Conference which will be held in a southern city, March 15-17. The place of the meeting will be fixed early in January.

In presenting the matter to the convention, Judge Hand stated that the South is already on the eve of important mineral developments.

The mineral production of Arkansas in 1926 was valued at \$87,000,000 from which the State received \$2,000,000 in severance taxes.

He said:

A large portion of the mineral production consists of oil. Arkansas has a number of mineral resources, chief among which are zinc, lead, manganese, coal, oxide, and various forms of valuable clays. But the mining industry, except for bauxite, is in a very limited stage. Arkansas produces 70 per cent of the bauxite mined in the country. During the war when the older fields were unable to meet the pressing demands for the production of lead, zinc, and manganese, the north Arkansas fields came to the rescue. It happens that these fields are off the main traveled paths of the industry. The trend of mining operations has been westward and the South has been overlooked.

Judge Hand stated that the American Mining Congress has done much in drawing the attention of the mining industry to the mineral possibilities of the South by having its representatives investigate these resources, resulting in the discovery of "virgin fields of various valuable minerals."

The American Mining Congress is pointing the way to the mining fraternity into these fields—

Said Judge Hand:

I hope the mining industry will cooperate in the development of these fields in the South, instead of going to Chile and other countries, as the foreign products compete with our own. The expansion of home industry and the making of an all-American mining industry will compensate for any cost that any branch of industry may have to bear by reason of this cooperation in the development of these fields. I regard the American Mining Congress as one of the greatest organizations of this country. I have known it and followed it closely for 20 years. When the American Mining Congress began its work the mining industry was regarded as a game of chance and luck, and was looked upon with suspicion by business interests. Mining is now reduced to a science and ranks in prestige with other lines of business. The work of the American Mining Congress in bringing and holding together the mining industry and purging the mining industry of fraudulent practices has elevated the mining industry to a basis of confidence on a parity with other lines of business. Since the American Mining Congress has made its influence felt in the South many business men of Arkansas have awakened to a realization of mining opportunity in the State. Arkansas has zinc, lead, manganese, lime, phosphates, cement, marble, and the finest building stone in the world. Within a few years Arkansas will be able to meet the demand for electrical energy for smelting and mining and other industries.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK].

#### FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the leading measures for the consideration of this Congress will be the subjects of farm relief and flood control. Farm conditions are too well known to be reviewed on this floor. Every Member of this House knows that our farmers have suffered more in the past eight years than in any other equal period of time in the history of this country. They are working just as hard as ever, practice the most rigid economy, and should have equal protection of the laws. The farmers have just as much right to enjoy some of the pleasures of life as any other class of citizens, and I hope that a bill may soon be enacted that will place our farmers on the same plane as other industries protected by laws. Our farmers can not continue to produce the necessities of life at a loss and should be assisted in obtaining relief from these conditions.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am before you at this time to discuss legislation for the control of floods in the United States, and this subject is also of great interest to our farmers, as well as the country in general. As preliminary to my remarks on this subject, however, I wanted to again call the attention of this House and the administration to the necessity of enacting agricultural legislation before we adjourn.

Since the disastrous floods last summer on the Mississippi River the attention of our people has been focused on this subject as never before. The Committee on Flood Control began to hold sessions long before Congress convened in December to give everybody that so desired an opportunity to be heard. I wish now to congratulate that great committee for this action and for the energetic and able manner in which it has been considering legislation for the control of the floods of the United States. I remember the two first weeks of the hearings that representatives from the various States in the Mississippi Valley and other sections were here to present their plans to the committee and assist the members of that committee in drafting an effective bill to present to Congress for its consideration. Never have I seen a committee work harder nor more conscientiously on a subject. Large delegations from different States were here to attend the hearings, and since Congress convened the committee has been holding hearings, and many times at night. The committee is seeking all the light and assistance they can get on this important subject. Like agricultural legislation, it is not a political bill and is not so considered by the committee, but is a subject that affects the whole country. This legislation will not only affect the Mississippi Valley and tributaries and other streams that contribute to the floods on the Mississippi, but will affect the country in its entirety.

Every Member of Congress appreciates the fact that this is a most important question, and that it is difficult to draft a bill to meet all objections. Many good bills have been introduced, and the committee has been considering them all and will soon report a bill for our consideration. We can not all have everything in the bill that we want, but we should make it just as good as possible and have it apply not only to the Mississippi River proper but to all tributary rivers and others that con-

tribute to the flood waters of the Mississippi. The importance of the Mississippi can not be overestimated in times of peace or war. It runs through the central part of the United States and carries much of our commerce and contributes, with its adjacent territory, to our agricultural products to a large extent. Without this great artery of transportation, freight rates in the central portion of our country would be higher than they are at the present time. With improvement in transportation on this river, we will get relief in rates. Much further assistance will be received by improved navigation on the tributaries by proper control, not only for flood relief but for purposes of navigation. There is no reason why navigation can not be had much farther up the Missouri than at this time, and no reason why navigation can not be carried out on other rivers, such as the Arkansas as far as Arkansas City, Kans., and even Wichita. It is easy to see how this would affect rates and transportation, in addition to internal improvements and control of the floods on many other streams. For many years the waters of the United States have been permitted to lay large areas of our most fertile land in waste and cause destruction to our citizens and their property, instead of controlling these waters for the use and benefit of our people. And it is no idle dream to say that they can in a large measure be controlled, to prevent such destructive floods, for navigation and other uses of the people.

The floods of this year on the Mississippi alone caused property damage to an amount which would be sufficient to construct levees, reservoirs, and storage basins at many places on these various streams. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not alone a money or property question, but a question of the lives of our people and a large part of them, too. A large portion of this water can be utilized for the protection and welfare of our citizens just as well as to let it go to their damage and destruction. In many parts of the United States water that would otherwise be wasted is made to serve mankind and much fertile land has been reclaimed by irrigation and many people given an opportunity to make a home and lead a useful life. We can continue to let it go to waste and destroy our people and their property, or confine it to our own use for the general good of the whole country. It is not a sectional question but one in which all our people are interested. You must remember that the land affected by the Mississippi and its tributaries comprises more than half of our land, industries, and people. It is a national problem and as such should be considered. All whom I have heard before the committee agreed to the national aspect of this subject, and the only difference I find is the question of the division of costs and the extent to which the bill should apply.

I appeared before the committee the first week of the hearings and urged that any bill reported for the consideration of Congress should combine the reservoir and storage plans with the levee system. By this method much of the water would be held back from the Mississippi. These reservoir and storage basins should be located on the tributaries and other rivers that contribute to the floods on the Mississippi. The Arkansas and Red Rivers contribute much to these flood waters and the same is true with the Washita, South Canadian, North Canadian, Cimarron, and other streams in Oklahoma. The construction of reservoirs and storage basins on these streams would not only be of great assistance in relieving the floods on the Mississippi, but would prevent great damage each year to Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Kansas, and Arkansas. It hurts a farmer just as much to have his crops, land, and property destroyed on one of these rivers in Oklahoma as it would if he lived on the Mississippi. It was shown to the committee by estimates of competent engineers that 200 reservoirs and storage basins could be constructed in Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma at a cost of \$130,000,000, and that such a system would render the Arkansas and Red Rivers absolutely harmless, so far as floods are concerned. This would help our people in many other ways, as reduction in transportation costs by making more rivers navigable. This plan would encourage farmers to build additional lakes and ponds on their farms, and would be of benefit in relieving the droughts of the West.

The floods last summer on the Mississippi alone affected 31 States and 41 per cent of the total area of the United States. That flood covered 12,500,000 acres of fine land, rendered 600,000 American citizens homeless who before had been prosperous, and damaged property to the enormous extent of approximately \$400,000,000. In addition to all this destruction and property loss, this flood caused suspension of our mails, greatly interfered with interstate commerce, and damaged industry to almost an indeterminate degree.

Reliable estimates show that landowners in Oklahoma lose more than \$10,000,000 annually in the destruction of land, crops, and other property by floods, and that the loss to our



State, cities, and public utilities each year will equal a like amount. Oklahoma has more than 782,000 acres of land subject to overflow, and competent men have estimated this as high as 2,000,000 acres, and the proper solution of this great question is of vital interest to our people as it is to the rest of the country. It not only affects the people who live near the Mississippi, but also affects those on other streams such as the Missouri and the Oklahoma streams that I have mentioned. The principal question, as has been stated, is to control the Mississippi floods, on account of its greatness and because it is a navigable stream. That is just what the plan that I have outlined will do, and, while we are doing that, we will also protect our other people who live on tributaries and other rivers that contribute to the floods. These floods clearly demonstrated that levees alone will not do the work, no matter how high they may be. About all that the levee system in itself will do is to raise the river bed. If these were 100 feet high, the same would be true, and the only thing accomplished is greater costs and maintenance. The testimony before the committee—and I heard most of it—was to the effect that levees, spillways, reservoirs, and storage basins would do the work and protect our citizens. Who will say that a method should not be devised that would render the same assistance to a resident on these other streams as he would be given if he lived on the Mississippi? It is neither a political nor a sectional question.

I believe the hearings developed fully the fact that it is a national question and must be dealt with from that viewpoint. Then the next conclusion naturally follows that the entire cost of construction should be borne by the Federal Government by congressional appropriations. This is the plan I favor, and I am opposed to charging any of the costs of construction against the landowners, States, or municipalities. The people in the levee districts have been taxed to death, and they can contribute no further. This land is the bread basket of our Government and must not only be protected but must be developed. Of course, it will cost something, and so do other governmental operations cost something. In my judgment, we could reduce other appropriations without any additional tax levy and without interfering in the least with any governmental activity to a sufficient amount to take care of this entire cost of construction. A reasonable appropriation could be made until the work is completed without adding a cent of additional cost to the Government. But, gentlemen of the House, work on the lower Mississippi alone should not be done and other portions of the Mississippi area left untouched and the people along the tributaries and other streams I have mentioned left to suffer by these destructive floods. They are also entitled to relief and their homes saved and property protected.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission here to insert a portion of the report and request of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, adopted December 8, 1927, to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on Mississippi flood control:

Lower Mississippi River control offers no protection to the greater area, greater values, greater population, greater commerce, greater economic resources, greater national development, greater necessity of protection, and greater tax-paying public in the flood-swept valleys of the streams above the leveed district, which district was picked out as the particular and sole concern of the Government. It is time now to deny that the Mississippi River from Cairo down is all of the Mississippi River or that it is the only territory entitled to protection.

The levee system ignores every available use of water in economic development, whether it be industrial, or agricultural, or navigation, or commerce. It contemplates sheer waste of that which is or might be extremely valuable in the upper area in all the above-named uses. It does not contemplate the reduction or control of floods where they do the greatest damage, which is before they have accumulated in the main stream, or the use of those flood waters in the reclamation of dry lands, which are as much entitled to governmental solicitude as reclamation of wet lands below.

The governmental policy of attempted control of Mississippi floods by strictly local works on the lower Mississippi has proven a failure in every high flood since it was started. The ordinary flood of 1927 demonstrated that the river so leveed had less than one-third the required flood capacity, and 226 breaks in levees resulted, mostly from undercutting, some from overflowing.

The people of the United States have expended many hundreds of millions of dollars—some figure seven hundred and fifty millions, other computations run down to two hundred and fifty millions—precise accuracy of figures is unimportant. They have supplied this money as fast as it could be economically spent, although constantly warned by eminent hydraulic engineers of the disasters that would attend the development and completion of the system. The warning was unheeded and the disasters have occurred.

This condition of unfairness finally became apparent to the eight States comprising the drainage basins of the Arkansas and Red Rivers,

whose flood destruction was the equal of the lower Mississippi and entirely ignored. Thereupon commissioners were appointed to work out a plan of flood control that would offer assured protection to the neglected properties in the valleys of those States and afford some real protection to the heretofore deceived and now bankrupt owners and residents of the leveed Mississippi. This commission is known as the interstate commission for the control of the Arkansas and Red Rivers, and is composed of 27 members, appointed by the governors of those States.

After a number of years' work, the commission has devised a plan of impounding in about 200 controlled reservoirs the flood run-off from more than one-third of the area drained by those rivers—actually about 40 per cent of the flood run-off. This would reduce to a condition of harmlessness all of the tributaries where reservoirs were placed; would keep the main stems of the Arkansas and Red Rivers and their principal tributaries down to a flowage within their bank limits; and would protect hundreds of millions of property in the valleys of these rivers and above the leveed interests, which have never engaged the concern of the Federal agencies.

This plan of assisting in flood control on the Mississippi by impounding the waters through reservoirs and storage basins on the Arkansas and Red Rivers, their tributaries, and the other streams mentioned above has been carefully worked out by competent engineers and others interested in this subject and who have given it much study.

I insert here a statement from the Oklahoma Conservation Commission concerning the flooded area along the rivers of that State:

Grand River or Neosho: The estimate is based on the theory that the Robinson Dam and improvement will be made, which will materially reduce the flooded area as exists to-day. Lands subject to overflow on the above theory are 17,500 acres.

Verdigris River: The Verdigris River proper has 65,600 acres of flooded area. The Caney River, Bird Creek, and Hominy, all tributaries to the Verdigris, add 37,000 acres of flooded area, making a total of 102,600 acres for the Verdigris and its main tributaries. This estimate may be a little low on the Verdigris proper, but the above is about right from the information I have.

Main Arkansas River in Oklahoma is about 270 miles and the valley lands subject to overflow are about 80,000 acres. Salt Fork and its tributaries have a flooded area of 30,000 acres.

Red Rock Creek has a flooded area of 3,200 acres.

Black Bear Creek has a flooded area of 6,400 acres. Both of these streams are tributaries to the main Arkansas.

Cimarron River in Oklahoma (not including that portion in Cimarron County, Okla.) equals 270 miles and has a flooded area of 58,400 acres, and its eight main tributaries have about 190 miles of valley lands, of which 19,200 acres are subject to overflow, making a total for the Cimarron and its main tributaries of 77,600 acres subject to overflow.

North Canadian River is about 420 miles from its mouth to Guymon in Texas County and the land subject to overflow equals 130,000 acres. Deep Fork, one of the main tributaries of the North Canadian, is about 110 miles long and the flooded area in this valley equals 38,000 acres. Wolf Creek and the other tributaries of the North Canadian have about 90 miles of valley land of which about 12,000 acres are subject to overflow, making a grand total of overflow lands in the North Canadian and its tributaries of 180,000 acres.

South Canadian River has about 360 miles in Oklahoma and about 280 miles of this valley are subject to overflow, making about 110,000 acres, and its tributaries, exclusive of the North Canadian and Deep Fork, equal about 70 miles of valley land, of which about 15,000 acres are subject to overflow, making a total for the Canadian River of 125,000 acres subject to overflow. This stream is so erratic and makes so many changes of its channel proper, that it is hard to come anywhere near making a correct estimate of the damaged lands because a farm to-day may be the river bed in 30 days.

Other small streams emptying into the Arkansas are Pole Cat, Illinois, and Pateau, covering about 60 miles of valley land—part of which is subject to overflow, especially Pateau Creek. The combined flooded area of these three streams equals 11,000 acres.

Red River: The tributaries of the Red River in Oklahoma include the Washita, Mud Creek, Beaver Creek, the two Cache Creeks, Deep Red, Red River of Oklahoma, Salt Fork, and Elm Creek, comprising about 640 miles of valley lands. The principal one of these eight streams is the Washita, which has about 270 miles of valley land of which 165 miles are subject to overflow, making approximately 370 miles of valley lands of which 175 miles are subject to overflow, making approximately 56,000 acres, making a grand total for the Red River district of approximately 109,000 acres subject to overflow. The flooding of the lands in this section of the State is quite erratic. Some years pass without any floods, while other years from two to three floods may occur at any time during the year causing great damage.

This brings the total flood area of all the streams in Oklahoma to 742,300 acres. It is safe to say that the floods in Oklahoma cause

an annual loss to the landowners of some ten to fifteen million dollars; besides, the loss to the State, counties, cities, railroads, and other public utilities possibly is equal to five to ten million dollars annually.

These figures compiled by W. C. Burke, engineer, Oklahoma City, Okla.

I mention these statements for the reason that they are made by competent men whose profession is engineering and who have had many years of experience in this line of work. In the Sixty-eighth Congress I introduced a bill authorizing the engineers of the War Department to make a preliminary survey of the South Canadian, North Canadian, Cimarron, and other rivers in Oklahoma, with a view to the control of their floods. Provision for a preliminary survey of these rivers was made in the general bill which became a law May 31, 1924, and which included my bill. The Arkansas River and other Oklahoma streams were also included. This was the first step to take under the law for a complete and regular survey for flood-control purposes.

The plan outlined in my remarks not only affects Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, and Arkansas but the entire Mississippi Valley and the country at large. Congress has provided large appropriations many times for the assistance of our citizens, few in number compared to those who will be relieved by a proper bill for Mississippi River flood control, and adequate funds should be provided for this purpose during this session of Congress. Oklahoma has contributed to the "reclamation fund" through the sale of public lands the sum of \$5,917,843.10, and not one cent of this amount has been spent in our State. What we ask now is that we be included in any bill for control of the floods on the lower Mississippi River, and our people and the people in the other States affected given the same protection as our other citizens, and at the same time greatly relieve the lower Mississippi River.

Mr. Chairman, this plan is feasible, practical, and the most economical plan for the control of the floods on the Mississippi River. The opinions of the Army engineers should be given due consideration and weight, but their opinions and work in the past have demonstrated that the opinions of others are also worthy to be considered. The Army engineers thought the floods could be controlled by levees, and this plan has totally failed to do the work. Competent engineers in civil life, just as competent as the Army engineers and just as experienced, advocate the plan of control by reservoirs and storage basins in conjunction with the levees.

Gentlemen of the House, Congress should not legislate by sections in this country, but should make the legislation apply to all the people who are similarly situated. The people on the rivers in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and the other States affected by these rivers should also be relieved from destructive floods just the same as the people who live on the Mississippi River proper. It is not merely a suggestion for protection of our people, but, while granting them this relief given others, you will greatly reduce the flood waters on the Mississippi River.

Mr. Chairman, I wish again to repeat that I am opposed to any of the cost of construction being charged to the land affected by these floods, or to any charge being assessed against any drainage district in these areas, or against any city, town, municipality, or any State. I hope and trust that Congress will take action at once on this problem that so greatly affects so many of our citizens.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

#### VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE CHAMBERS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, during the last Congress I addressed the House upon the question of the need of the ventilation of this Chamber, and it may be of interest to the Members of the House to know just what has been done with reference to that matter since that time. At that time I called the attention of the House to the large number of deaths that have occurred among the Members of Congress since the year 1922. In that time 30 Members of the House and 11 Senators have died from various causes. Whether the impure ventilation of this and the Senate Chamber had anything to do with their deaths is a question, but anyone who sits here and undertakes to be upon the floor of the House while we are having sessions knows that something is radically wrong with the ventilating system of the Chamber. The matter was called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations at the last session of Congress. The chairman of that committee would not act then, because he said he did not have before him sufficient data.

The consideration of the necessary work to be done and apparatus to be installed to provide for the ventilation and air

conditioning of the legislative Chambers of the United States Capitol is a work of such importance that when the matter was before the House Committee on Appropriations during the last Congress it was suggested that a careful survey be made of actual conditions by the most expert authorities in the employ of the Government upon the subjects of ventilation and air conditioning and that the assistance of the Public Health Service be enlisted in connection with the Bureau of Mines in the formation of a committee of experts, who should take into consideration all of the conditions to be met in a work of this kind. This suggestion was made by the Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, and based upon the fact that for many years the subject of ventilation has been considered to a greater or less extent almost from the time of the occupancy of the House and the Senate wings of the Capitol. It is proper to state, however, that such investigations as have been made and such installations as have resulted from these investigations have been directed wholly to the introduction of more or less air into the legislative Chambers and the conditioning of the air so that there might be a suitably tempered air, both as to its humidity and temperature, had not been satisfactorily considered or the problem solved.

Accordingly, through the Public Health Service, there was organized the following committee, the chairman of which is Prof. C. E. A. Winslow, professor of public health, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. Other members are—

D. D. Kimball, consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.; F. I. Cooper, heating and ventilating engineer, Boston, Mass.; A. M. Feldman, consulting engineer, New York, N. Y.; R. E. Hall, engaged in ventilation of theaters, New York; F. R. Still, vice president American Blower Co., New York; Prof. A. C. Willard, University of Illinois; L. R. Thompson, surgeon in charge of Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.; David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol; Dr. R. R. Sayers, Chief Surgeon Bureau of Mines; Leonard Greenburg, sanitary engineer Public Health Service.

This committee met in Washington and fully considered all of the conditions connected with the ventilation and air conditioning of the Senate Chamber and the Hall of the House of Representatives, and after becoming acquainted with all of the facts necessary, they proceeded to formulate a series of resolutions, stating from their mature deliberations the conditions that should be properly met in the manufacture and installation of apparatus required to properly ventilate and condition the air of these two Chambers. This work occupied some time for the reason that the conditions of other large audience rooms and the temperatures and humidity considered necessary were taken into consideration in attempting to define such conditions as would be required to be met for the two Chambers of the Senate and House. Whereupon a circular letter was prepared setting forth the fundamental resolutions adopted by this committee and naming them items 1, 2, and 3. This circular letter was sent to a selected number of bidders, believed by the committee to be capable of manufacturing and installing suitable apparatus to meet the conditions to be satisfied in this work. The list selected was as follows:

Carrier Engineering Co., 750 Frelinghuysen Avenue, Newark, N. J.; Brunswick Kroeschell Co., New Brunswick, N. J.; Cooling & Air Conditioning Co., 31 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; York Manufacturing Co., 634 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Wittmeier Machine Co., Chicago, Ill.

It has been deemed necessary to acquaint those interested in the subject of ventilation and air conditioning with the steps which have been taken in accordance with the suggestions of Mr. MADDEN to determine just what should be considered an ideal condition of ventilation, temperature, and humidity of these legislative Chambers, so that it might be understood that as far as possible it has been attempted to place this subject upon a proper scientific basis so that the subject of ventilation and air condition may be decisively settled.

The following circular letter was sent out by Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,  
Washington, D. C., December 3, 1927.

VENTILATION AND AIR CONDITIONING OF THE SENATE CHAMBER AND THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: You are respectfully invited to prepare plans, specifications, and estimates, in triplicate, such plans and specifications being prepared to describe the system proposed to ventilate the Senate Chamber and the Hall of the House of Representatives, these two sections to be considered as separate units, with separate plans and specifications and estimates of cost prepared for each unit.



The attention of prospective bidders is invited to the following item, which should govern the plans, specifications, and estimates to be submitted:

## ITEM NO. 1

For summer conditions, the plans should be of sufficient capacity to be capable of maintaining in the Chambers during periods of maximum occupancy (which should be determined by the Architect of the Capitol) a temperature not in excess of 75°, with a relative humidity not in excess of 55 per cent with outside weather conditions of 95° dry bulb and 75° wet bulb. The plant should be capable of maintaining in the Chambers during the winter a temperature up to 75° with a relative humidity of 30 to 50 per cent. These conditions shall be produced without noticeable drafts and without noticeable odors in any part of either Chamber, as measured by a variation in CO<sub>2</sub> content in excess of four parts per 10,000 between different points in the Chamber. The matter of dust and bacteria is not provided for in these requirements, for the reason that it is not regarded as of importance, and, in any case, the operation of the plant will take care of this matter adequately.

## ITEM NO. 2

Such conditions can, in our judgment, only be realized by a system operating on the downward principle—that is, with the air flowing from the ceiling toward and out through the floor—with careful provision for initial horizontal diffusion capable of delivering a maximum of 45 cubic feet of air per person per minute, and of variable capacity, through means of speed control of fans, to a minimum of 10 cubic feet of air per person per minute, both figures being based on the figures of maximum occupancy of the Chambers and with temperature and humidity control adequate to meet the range and limits stated above.

The system to be installed should be provided with a complete equipment of indicating and recording devices to give indication and record of temperature and humidities throughout the system and Chambers.

It is recommended that each contractor submitting a proposal for the installation of these two systems shall be required to submit complete installation or working plans showing all details of apparatus and equipment, including refrigeration equipment, dehumidifier equipment, fans, motors, controllers, duct work, and all auxiliary equipment, and a complete specification describing in detail the material, installation, and workmanship, and shall further give all required detail as to equipment, including number and size of units of refrigeration, capacity of same; operating speeds, cylinder displacement; operating pressures; operating temperatures; brake horsepower required per ton of refrigeration, with condensing water at 75–80, and 85° temperature and the method of cooling this condenser water; amount of water (in gallons per minute) required per ton of refrigeration at 75–80, and 85°; actual tonnage produced by each refrigerating machine with condensing water at 85°; capacity and dimensions of humidifiers and quantity of water for same; capacity and size of fans, motors, and pumps; size and location of all ducts and piping; duct and piping installation; means of temperature and humidity control for both winter and summer; method of air diffusion and method of varying quantities of air, including descriptions of system for reading and recording temperatures and humidities throughout the Chambers and ventilating systems; and such other details as the Architect of the Capitol may require. Each proposal for the installation of this equipment shall specifically indicate the character and extent of guaranties offered.

## ITEM NO. 3

We believe that, in general, comfort will be most effectively secured in cold weather by maintaining in the Chambers a temperature between 66° and 70°, with a respective relative humidity of 50–40 per cent, and in warm weather by keeping this temperature 10 to 15° below the outdoor temperature, with a relative humidity not over 50 per cent.

If it is desired to maintain higher temperature in winter, the relative humidity may be decreased correspondingly to 30 per cent at 75°.

The temperature and humidities to be actually maintained shall be determined from time to time by the Committee on Rules of the Senate and by the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives.

An estimate has been made for the contemplated work in the Senate Chamber, and an estimate for the amount required for the Hall of the House of Representatives will be presented to the next Seventieth Congress for action.

Intending bidders should inspect the two Legislative Chambers and acquaint themselves with the structural conditions of each Chamber, securing such information as will enable the preparation of the plans, specifications, and estimates. The information attached, stating the results to be required of the system of ventilation and air conditioning desired, has been prepared by a committee selected from the best informed authorities on the subjects included in the work to be performed, and the specifications must guarantee that the conditions desired can be obtained by the system specified. This committee will be given the opportunity to examine and pass upon the plans, specifications, and estimates submitted under this circular letter.

It is understood that the bidders shall especially guarantee that the Government shall be protected from any claims for damages arising from the use of any device which may infringe upon a patented device owned by other than the persons or persons submitting plans, specifications, and estimates.

Plans and specifications submitted must show conclusively a possible performance of the system proposed to adequately secure the resulting ventilation and air conditioning stated as necessary by the information prepared by the committee for the guidance of those submitting specifications and estimates of cost.

The Government will remove from the room where new air-conditioning machinery is to be installed any apparatus or stored articles which may interfere with the new installation and will cut all openings in floors and walls, where necessary, for the new air ducts.

In existing air shafts which may be used as space for new air ducts, the Government will move to one side all steam, water, and air-carrying pipes and all wiring of every description.

The Government will remove all fans, heaters, and motors, the use of which will be discontinued, and where space occupied by them is needed for new duct work.

The Government will bring to points just within the room where new apparatus is to be installed steam at a maximum of 125 pounds gauge pressure, water in capacity needed, and direct electric current at 110 volts pressure or alternating electric current at 25 cycles and pressure up to 440 volts.

The estimates must show that they are based upon an intent to furnish all labor and material and install in place; and that the bidder agrees to, in the event of his estimates, plans, and specifications being accepted, enter into a contract, with such bond or securities as may be required for the performance of the contract in a satisfactory manner.

The specifications, plans, and estimates of cost must be inclosed in an envelope marked "Architect of the Capitol, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.," and marked upon the lower left-hand corner of the envelope "Specifications, plans, and estimates, ventilation of the Senate and House Chambers, United States Capitol."

The bids will be publicly opened at 2 p. m. in the office of the Architect of the Capitol on January 20, 1928, and the right of the architect to reject any or all bids and to waive any informality in any bid is hereby reserved.

DAVID LYNN,  
Architect of the Capitol.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Appropriations, when we have under consideration the legislative appropriation bill, may consider this and make provision for this very necessary work to be done. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

## FARM RELIEF

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I imagine that our constituents back home do not differ from other constituents any more than we their representatives differ from one another. Yet, however different they may be, I imagine that upon several fundamentals, so far as legislation in this Congress is concerned, we would find all of them in agreement.

So far as waste and extravagance and economy are concerned, we would find them of one mind. In public affairs they want no waste, they want no extravagance, and they want sane economy. They do not want foolish economy. They want sane economy and sane expenditure of public money.

I imagine they would be in hearty agreement on the subject of affording some sort of definite relief to the producers of the country—to the farmers and stockmen—not something merely to be spent in their name. All of the money that Congress has spent, which it has been appropriating for the Agricultural Department, has been spent to increase production; and that is the very thing that the farmers are suffering from to-day. They suffer from increased production. None of the proposals that we have passed in behalf of agriculture in the way of farm relief has been to give to the farmer the benefit of that surplus. The McNary-Haugen bill did not propose to give the farmers the benefit of any profit that could be derived from the surplus when handled by the organization that we provided for. The profits that were to be derived from the holding and sale of surplus were not to be divided among the farmers. They were to get no part of it.

I take it also that our people would be in hearty accord and agreement upon the proposition that we must afford them better railroad facilities in transporting commodities; that is, lower freight rates. I think our tariffs are higher than they should be.

The producers in my section of the country frequently send their products to market, and the freight tariffs cost them more than they receive.

In such fundamentals it occurs to me that all of our constituents are of one mind, and that there should be some relief.

I do not know whether or not you gentlemen keep your ears close to the ground in respect to what your people are thinking about and how they feel on public subjects. There were 314,000 people in the last census in my district, the seventeenth district of Texas, and over 350,000 people now live there. Those 350,000 people living in my district to-day can speak collectively only through their political conventions. That is the only way in which they can voice their sentiments collectively. When the Democrats of my district speak, when they say, "We, the Democrats of the seventeenth congressional district," that means "We, the people of the seventeenth district," because in my district the people are practically all Democrats. There are a few Republicans, and I will say here that the few white ones down there in my district are splendid men, men of good judgment, men who are the very best of citizens. But there are very few of them, so I say that when the Democrats speak collectively in convention they speak for the people of my district. I want now to call your attention to how they expressed themselves on some public questions in the last convention in which they met in my district, on August 28, 1926. That is the last time they spoke as delegates selected from the conventions in all of the 19 counties in my district. They met in convention on August 28, 1926, and expressed themselves definitely on some of these important questions of legislation that we have had before Congress, and I now call your attention to some of their expressions. Among other things they resolved:

(3) That our junior Senator has been a luxury too costly and expensive to the people to be continued in office longer than his six years, there having been spent out of the public Treasury \$65,984.61 in the contest over his seat, and on February 23, 1926, Senator MAYFIELD had the Senate pay him the additional sum of \$30,500 as his own personal expenses.

(4) That we can not approve of the action of Senator MAYFIELD in voting February 28, 1925, to raise his own salary for the term of office to which he had already been elected.

(5) That we can not approve of the action of Senator MAYFIELD in supporting the Parker bill that deprived the American people of all voice and representation around the council table in railroad disputes.

(6) That we can not approve of the action of Senator MAYFIELD in supporting the Haugen bill, which would have wasted \$375,000,000 to begin with, would have unjustly taxed southern cotton, and promised no real relief to southern farmers.

Those people are not much different from your people. They are the same kind of people; they are American citizens, interested in public questions. They have the right to express themselves on national legislation and national affairs.

And right here, on that Haugen bill, what are we going to do about farm relief this year? Are we going to let the Senate say to us that we can not pass in this House and get it through any measure except the so-called McNary-Haugen bill, and none other? Are we again going to be told that?

I have been here long enough to know that every agricultural bill that we pass, any farm relief measure that we pass here, will be known as the McNary-Haugen bill under our system. Every bill of that importance that comes from the Committee on Agriculture is going to bear the name of the chairman of the House committee and the name of the chairman of the Senate committee.

The tax bill that we passed here recently illustrates that. We all know as a matter of fact that it is a Jack Garner bill, but it is known as the Green measure because, forsooth, Mr. GREEN of Iowa is chairman of the committee. No matter whose impress is put upon the measure, it is known by the name of the chairman.

I remember when that McNary-Haugen bill was first introduced in 1924. If you will compare the 1924 bill with the 1927 bill of the same name you would hardly recognize the two as coming from the same source. If you compare the 1924 bill with the 1926 bill and then with the 1927 bill which we passed last year you will see that we forced many important changes to be made as the years have passed. Yet they were all known as McNary-Haugen bills.

The first bill that was introduced by Mr. HAUGEN in 1924 provided for no relief for cotton, one of the greatest agricultural commodities raised in this country. When I asked the distinguished chairman from Iowa why cotton was left out, he said the cotton producers did not want it in. They recognized that there was nothing definite in the way of relief for cotton in it. But in 1926, when he wanted his bill passed and knew that he had to get the cotton Representatives in line with him, enough of them to pass it, he put cotton in.

What did he then provide? He provided that there should be an equalization tax of \$2 per bale, because he knew if you taxed the cotton farmers more than \$2 a bale their Representatives would not stand for it and would not vote for the bill. Yet we realized at that time that an equalization fee of less than \$5 or even \$10 a bale on cotton would hardly accomplish anything beneficial for cotton. Yet they restricted it to \$2 a bale, and put a provision in the bill that the board could raise it if they saw fit, and they would have raised it to \$10 or \$15 before they got through, we all know.

What else did they first provide in the McNary-Haugen bill? They provided that the farmer who failed to pay this equalization tax could be fined \$5,000 and sent to a Federal prison for a year; that is, that the producer, the man whom they were seeking to help, could be thus penalized if he saw fit not to pay a tax on his commodity. Naturally some of us rebelled, and before the bill got through we forced that provision out of the bill. The 1927 bill did not retain that provision. It did not penalize the farmer. It did not propose to fine him \$5,000 and send him to a Federal prison for a year.

There was another important change we caused by fighting against that first bill. The first bill was to waste \$375,000,000; certainly that much. We caused the framers of that bill to reduce it \$125,000,000 when they brought the 1927 bill in.

Why is it that we can not provide a bill here for the welfare of the farmers that will see to it that the profit which is derived from properly marketing their surplus is distributed back among the farmers who raised it? Whenever you bring a bill into this House of that character I think you will find every Representative of farmers here supporting it heartily. The other bill did not do it.

Why can we not get to work and pass the kind of a bill that our farmer friend from Kansas, Mr. Tinscher, advocated—our farmer friend who used to be a leader on this floor for the administration? Whenever the administration was embarrassed or bothered, instead of calling on JIM BEEGE, as they do now, they called on Tinscher. They kept Tinscher on the floor all the time to protect the administration, and especially to protect the farming interests.

You remember Tinscher brought in here a bill which was a good, honest-to-God farmers' measure when he first introduced it. It was to do away with gambling in farm futures. It was to stop it altogether, and if that bill had been passed it would have benefited every farmer in the United States far more than the McNary-Haugen bill could have promised in any respect. But when Tinscher got through with his bill, when the interests got through with Tinscher's bill, it was not stock gambling in the daytime that was stopped but only gambling at night, when the gamblers were sleeping. [Laughter.]

I have introduced another bill here which would stop gambling in futures on cotton, grain, wool, and mohair in the daytime and in the nighttime, too. It will stop all such gambling in farm products. Will you support it? I hope you will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was very much interested in the speech made a few minutes ago by my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on the question of farm relief. There is no other matter of equal importance before us and the American Congress. We all depend on the farmers either directly or indirectly. My district is made up largely of farmers. It consists of 20 splendid rural counties, and I would rather help in the passage of a bill giving help to those wonderful people than to help in the passage of any other measure. If to-day I were to ask Members of Congress the question, Are you in favor of a farm relief bill? practically every man here would say "Yes," and yet when we come to consider a bill a great many people who would say that they are in favor of a farm relief bill turn aside and oppose the bill. We differ in our meaning when we say we are in favor of helping the farmer. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] hit the keynote just a little while ago when he said we were willing to help the farmer produce. We all agree on that, and a great many Members of Congress, when they say they are in favor of helping the farmer, only mean they are in favor of helping the farmer produce. Thus far and no further. The gambler is in favor of helping the farmer produce; the speculator is in favor of helping the farmer produce; those who steal a part of what the farmer earns are in favor of helping the farmer produce.



The real trouble comes about when we attempt to secure the passage of a bill to help the farmer sell his products for a better price and eliminate the unnecessary middlemen. The fight comes when we try to help the farmer sell his product to better advantage. Such a bill meets opposition on every hand.

We have established a great many experiment stations in this country by State legislation and by national enactment. Every one of those experiment stations experiments in helping the farmer produce more. Not a single one of them helps the farmer to sell his product to the consumer at a better price.

I have introduced a bill, which I do not propose to discuss very fully now, to appropriate money and authorize the Department of Agriculture to experiment in the sale of food and food products of the farmer directly from the producer to the consumer, leaving out the middleman. I do not expect very much support for that bill from Congress. There are too many Members in favor of the middleman and really against the farmer.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. What are you going to do with the middleman?

Mr. LANKFORD. I would eliminate the unnecessary middleman if I could.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. What are you going to provide for him?

Mr. LANKFORD. I do not provide anything in this experiment for the middleman. I want the Department of Agriculture to experiment in selling the food from the producer to the consumer. I do not intend to discuss that bill very fully at present, but will gladly do so later. I am just saying, Mr. BLANTON, that the purpose of most of the experiment stations is to help the farmer produce more. We can get all the money we want to establish experiment stations to help the farmer produce more. The farmers' bulletins which are issued from time to time, and which we send out, are for that purpose. It is hard, in fact impossible, it seems, to get appropriations to help the farmers sell for better prices but easy to get help to boost production.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CHINDELOM). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, how much time did I use of the time originally allotted to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was recognized for five minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yielded the gentleman 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk advises the Chair that he understood it was 5 minutes, and the Clerk notified the Chair when the 5 minutes had been exhausted. The Chair regrets there was a misunderstanding. The gentleman has only consumed 5 minutes. If the original allowance was 20 minutes the gentleman is entitled to recognition for 15 minutes longer.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yielded the gentleman 20 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose at another time to discuss more fully the bill which I introduced to authorize the Department of Agriculture to experiment in the sale of farm food products directly from the producer to the consumer, but at this time I want to talk a little along the lines of a bill which I have introduced to establish a farmers' finance corporation. I have occupied a rather embarrassing position for many, many years as a Member of Congress in connection with farm relief measures. I have been unable during past Congresses to approve any bill introduced, and yet I was unable to draw a bill which would satisfy my convictions in this respect, and am now glad to offer a bill meeting my own approval. I have voted for the McNary-Haugen bill every time it has come up, not because I approved it as a whole, but because to my mind it was the best bill in sight and was really better than no bill at all, and I was glad to support it. I hoped it could be passed and its faults remedied from time to time. I have not heretofore favored in toto any bill because to my mind all of these bills failed in certain respects. To begin with, all of the bills heretofore introduced—and I say this with all kindness to those who have introduced them—failed to help the farmer directly. They all provided for the setting up of machinery, organizations, and so forth, and so on, through which we would attempt to help the farmer. Again, all of these bills, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said a little while ago, provided certain machinery or organizations to buy all of the farmer's product when it was selling at a depressed price, thereby taking the farmer's product away from him at a loss to the farmer, with this organization all the while hoping to make a profit out of the farmer's product,

after it had passed from the hands of the individual farmer. That would only add one more speculator to the already too large a list.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. We have taken from under the provisions of the trust act the farmers' cooperative associations and we have passed the warehousing and classification act for cotton. That is not exactly the correct wording of the act, but that is what it means. You take a bale of cotton; you grade the cotton and put it in a warehouse; then you create a cooperative organization; and if you will add to that some finance corporation which will take care of the cotton that rests in the warehouse and market it in an orderly way it seems to me you will take care of cotton.

Mr. LANKFORD. I think my bill does that and goes much further than that in many very vital respects. I have been endeavoring, as I said, to work out some plan to help the individual farmer hold his cotton and get a better price for his cotton when the cotton does go up. I have tried to work out a plan to help the farmer directly in his attempt to hold his cotton. I have furthermore tried to work out a plan which would set up an organization of the farmers' friends, not his enemies, to handle his problems, and then I have been most anxious to work out a bill which would solve the overproduction problem.

The great objection to the McNary-Haugen bill and the other farm relief bills is that to my mind they provide no proper control of the overproduction problem. We all admit that if we help the farmer get a better price for his product, without some kind of control of production, the incentive is there to produce more, and as fast as he produces more to the extent of an unusually large surplus he tears down the machinery which we set up in his behalf; and every bill must necessarily have failure written on its face if it does not carry with it some method to control the overproduction of these basic commodities.

The McNary-Haugen bill attempts to control this by an equalization fee. I do not like the idea of an equalization fee, and I voted for the McNary-Haugen bill in spite of the equalization fee provision.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LANKFORD. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BLANTON. After you collect the equalization fee out of the commodity and raise a fund to take care of the surplus and hold it and market it, and after you have marketed it and made a big profit on it, why does not the McNary-Haugen bill distribute that profit back to the farmers who raised the commodity?

Mr. LANKFORD. That is a good objection to the bill and is one of the objections I had to it.

Mr. BLANTON. If they had proposed to distribute that profit back to the producers the bill would have been much stronger.

Mr. LANKFORD. That is one objection I had to the McNary-Haugen bill, even though I voted for it, and it is the objection I have to a great many of the other proposed farm-relief measures.

Let me now tell you what I have attempted to do to solve this problem. I have introduced a bill to create the farmers' finance corporation, and I do not care if they take my bill and call it the McNary-Haugen bill or anything else they please. I think the plan of my bill is good, and I want to see it enacted into law in behalf of the farmer.

Mr. BLANTON. If it ever comes out of the committee it will be reintroduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and will be called the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. LANKFORD. And I would consider it an honor, and it would be a pleasure and a privilege to lend my help in putting into any bill provisions that would help the American farmer, regardless of what name the bill might go by. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

My bill creating the farmers finance corporation provides for a corporation created somewhat along the lines of the War Finance Corporation. I used the first six or seven sections of the War Finance Corporation act as a basis for my bill, simply changing the wording from War Finance Corporation to farmers' finance corporation.

I provide in this bill that the farmers' finance corporation shall lend money through the banks of the country to the individual farmer at the average which the commodities brought for the last 10 years, provided those planting 75 per cent of the acreage of the commodity, cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, or other basic products have signed a contract with each other, with the bank through which they do business, and with this corporation, binding them to let the cotton advisory council or the wheat ad-

visory council or whatever commodity advisory council it may be, determine what reduction of acreage shall be made from year to year so as not to probably produce a surplus.

This contract must be signed before they get the relief. The relief goes directly to the individual farmer to help the individual farmer hold his product, and when the price goes up he still owns it and gets the increase in price. This contract must be signed by those planting 75 per cent of the acreage of the commodity before the law becomes binding or at least before operations begin as to that particular commodity.

Some people may say, "Oh, the farmers will not sign that contract." If the farmers will not sign the contract, then they receive no benefit under it. It is more or less of a 50-50 proposition.

Under my bill Congress would practically say to the American farmer that the great problem is overproduction, and we will help you become independent if you will work together for your own good.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. With pleasure.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman who wants to make possible no surplus of farm products in this country. Suppose there is a large and increasing production throughout the world, how is the gentleman going to keep the production of wheat from Australia, Russia, and South America, as well as other products of those countries, from flooding this country after you have fixed the price under your bill?

Mr. LANKFORD. So far as products being brought in from other countries is concerned, we keep products from other countries out of this country in behalf of the manufacturers, and I think we can do the same thing in behalf of the farmers.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Why does not the gentleman say we would have to do this by a protective tariff?

Mr. LANKFORD. I am in favor of a protective tariff for those things which help my farmers when the Republicans are voting a protective tariff on everything that hurts my farmers. I favor a protective tariff on farm products, especially when there is a protective tariff provided by the party now in power on manufactured articles which the farmer must buy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If my friend will permit, would not that be the only way you could keep out this surplus from the other countries of the world—by a protective tariff?

Mr. LANKFORD. Probably that would be true, and I would certainly favor that kind of tariff under those circumstances.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. JONES. A protective tariff would not enable the farmer to dispose of a surplus that he had in this country, would it?

Mr. LANKFORD. No; it would not do that.

Mr. JONES. It would not begin to solve that problem?

Mr. LANKFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. And on most stable farm commodities we produce a surplus in this country.

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes. However, I do not want to make a tariff speech at this time.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes; but after this I must decline to yield further, as I want to explain my bill more in detail.

Mr. LEAVITT. Is it not true that practically all farm products are now under a protective tariff?

Mr. LANKFORD. But it is also true that you can not put a tariff on enough farm products to overcome the evil done the farmers by the tariff on the stuff he buys.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, in respect of the question asked by my colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES], the debenture plan proposed by the National Grange would cover that matter.

Mr. JONES. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and I would like to see that plan enacted into law.

Mr. LANKFORD. The debenture plan, to my mind, is too indirect. It seeks to help the man who has bought cotton, for instance. Let us help the grower and not the buyer. If I have time, I will refer to the debenture plan again before I resume my seat.

Mr. BLANTON. In the gentleman's proposed bill does it provide that any profits that are made from the final handling and marketing of that product are to be distributed back to the producer?

Mr. LANKFORD. My bill enables the farmer to hold any product until the price goes up so that he can get the increase in price. So, of course, he would get the benefit of the increase. That is one of the best provisions in my bill. Let me say this, for I will not have time to go through with the bill

in detail, the plan I am presenting to-day for your consideration has in it the beginning of a scheme by which, to my mind, the farmers can work out their financial salvation. Is it not a good scheme, a good plan, a workable idea, to simply say to the American farmer, Here is your great problem—that of overproduction. We are willing to help you solve it, we are willing to help you market your crops in an orderly way, but before we do that we want you to do something in the matter of controlling production.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, my idea is to endeavor to control the production of basic commodities by a contract made by the farmers with each other and with the banks and with the organization providing that the Government gives them certain aid and assistance, and that they do certain things in their own behalf in return.

As far as I know that idea never has been put in the form of a bill heretofore.

Now, I want to say that after I introduced this bill as a separate bill (H. R. 77), I took the McNary-Haugen bill as title 1 and then put my bill in as title 2, and reintroduced the two in one as H. R. 7739. These bills can be passed as one bill. If the people growing cotton decide that they want to operate under my bill—that is, under title 2 of H. R. 7739—enabling the farmers to hold their product, there will be no necessity of going any further. The growers of wheat might want to operate under title 1 and there would be no necessity for their attempting to begin operations under title 2. My bill has a complete referendum in it. It requires that the contract shall run for two years, and unless 75 per cent of the farmers sign it it does not go into operation, and then 10 per cent more must sign within one year, making 85 per cent, and then 10 per cent more within the next two years, making it 95 per cent. If the farmers do not like the plan, the contracts are for only two years and they do not have to renew them.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I shall be glad to.

Mr. SHREVE. In the last analysis will the gentleman's bill limit production?

Mr. LANKFORD. My bill would help the farmers to enter into a contract with each other, the banks and the corporations controlling the production of a particular commodity. They would control it as a matter of contract, and not as a matter of law.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Where is the money to come from?

Mr. LANKFORD. Just where it comes from in all of these bills, from the Government, by an appropriation for this purpose. My bill provides that the Government shall own the stock and put up the money just as the Government did in the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. How much of an appropriation does the gentleman's bill provide?

Mr. LANKFORD. Five hundred million dollars.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does the Government ever get it back?

Mr. LANKFORD. No; unless the corporation liquidates. If the corporation ever liquidates, the Government, owning the stock, would get the benefit of it.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Who pays the losses?

Mr. LANKFORD. Well, it would result just the same as in the War Finance Corporation. Let me say this: Many are willing to lose money in the shipping business. We are losing money and putting great burdens on the farmers, helping manufacturing interests; many are willing to spend money helping the railroads, but those same people say, "For God's sake, don't pass any legislation for the farmer; you might lose some money of the Government."

I am willing that money shall be spent in helping the farmer just as it is being lost in helping shipping, manufacturing, or the banking interests of the country. I do not believe the Government would lose any money on this proposition, because if the farmers control production within reasonable bounds they can control their own prices as manufacturers do and other concerns do to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, let me say briefly before my time expires that my bill represents my best conclusions on the subject of farm relief after months and years of most careful study of the matter.

It is a most important subject and requires much time in order to discuss any bill fully. There are many features of my bill that would require much more time than I am now allotted.

I will be heard again and again by speech, extension of remarks, in appearances before the committees, and otherwise in behalf of my bill. I am sure it is a good plan and I want you to understand it and I am sure you will then agree with me.



If my bill does what I think it does, it is the best farm bill ever written.

I am sure a careful study of the bill will convince anyone that I am right. Here is what I claim it would do for the farmer, which the other bills either fail to do or do in an indefinite way:

My bill helps the farmer directly and not indirectly—puts the money in his own pocket instead of in the pocket of some one for him to be delivered to him after certain expenses are paid.

The farmers' finance corporation under my bill would loan the money to the farmer through the banks, letting the banks make 1 per cent, and getting the money to the individual farmer at 5 per cent or less. The loan would be made to the farmer and not to some one else for him who could charge him an unreasonable profit for getting it for him.

The loan being made to the individual farmer at the average which his product has sold for the last 10 years, the individual farmer would be able to hold his own cotton until it advanced in price and get the benefit of the increase instead of selling his commodity to some other organization, as provided in other bills, and thus losing the increase of price brought about by the holding of cotton or reduction of acreage.

The help of curtailment of acreage under my bill will inure to the benefit of the farmer who has held over his cotton because of the loan and he will also receive an increase of price on what he makes on the reduced acreage. He gets the increase on the hold over and on the new production, while under the other bills he would not help on the hold over, for he could not hold over but must sell, in most instances, to the organization helped by the Government or some one else.

My bill makes clear and definite the rights of the farmer under it. The other bills do not. Take the debenture plan, for instance; it would cost the Government much money in an effort to help the farmer by helping the exporter of cotton. I can not now discuss that plan in full. It would require an entire speech for that purpose, but all who understand that plan must admit that it would help the man or concern who buys the farmer's product when he goes to ship his commodity across the ocean. Would this help the farmer? Maybe it would. The question is, Would the benefit which the exporter gets ever ooze through to the farmer? I fear very little would. The help in this way is too indirect. I want direct help. I do not at all like to help the higher up on the theory that some of the help will eventually ooze through half a dozen pockets of the profiteers of the country to the farmers. Let us help the farmers and not other people, on the theory that perhaps the farmer will some time in some way get a little of the drippings from the fingers or pockets of the speculators.

Again my bill cuts out all red tape and only uses the banks which are already in existence and allows them a definite profit. The help under my bill is definite and anyone can tell any farmer exactly the help he will get if the bill goes into effect as to cotton or any other commodity.

Who can tell the farmer what help he will get under the McNary-Haugen bill? We can more easily tell him what he will lose. All we can hope for is that he will gain more than he will lose.

Who can tell the farmer who grows cotton how much money arising from the debenture plan will ooze through the pockets of those who have bought the farmer's cotton and that it will happen to fall where the farmer can get it?

Who can tell the farmer how much help he will get under some of the other so-called farm relief bills which set up expensive machinery to buy the farmers' products at a loss to the farmers and hold these products, not for a profit to the farmer who has sold his commodity but for a profit to the organization? How much will the farmer get when the next year after he has cut his acreage and cotton starts up and this cotton which has been held over not by the farmer but by the organization under the terms of the law is dumped back on the market to break the price?

My bill would help the farmer curtail production by mutual contract for the benefit of the farmer. Some of the other bills would attempt to make the farmer curtail by the harsh punishment of financial loss in order to run up the price of what they had bought from the farmer.

My bill authorizes the appointment of the advisory commodity council by the governors of the States producing the particular commodity to be handled rather than by the President of the United States. This would put the control of production and marketing in the hands of the friends of the farmers. The governors of the cotton-growing States, for instance, could select better men for the cotton growers than could be selected by the President.

I know right now that some one will say that all Federal officers will have to be appointed by the President or some one

selected by him if they are not elective. I have thought of this phase of the matter and am convinced that under my bill the advisory council would not be Federal officers, but would only be officers called into being by a contract and only recognized as officials helping carry out the contract for the control of production and marketing, and so forth. I have no fear on this account, and shall be very glad to argue this phase of the matter more fully later.

Again my bill is good because it is only an offer to the farmers. They can refuse it if they do not like it. It does not at all force anything on them they may not like.

But I must conclude. I shall argue various features of my bill again from time to time.

In conclusion let me say that in my humble judgment my bill would put the control of the farmer's great problems in the hands of his friends, not his enemies; would help the farmer directly not indirectly; provides a complete solution of the over-production problem; would enable the farmer within reasonable bounds to name his own price for his commodity; would put him for the first time on a parity with other enterprises and industries. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as has been explained by Chairman SHREVE, this bill, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor for the fiscal year 1929, carries appropriations amounting to \$89,047,985.14. It covers a great variety of items embracing a multitude of subjects. In preparing it for submission to the whole committee great credit must be accorded to the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SHREVE, as well as to the Messrs. OLIVER and GRIFFIN, who spent a large part of last summer in visiting by rail, by water, by motor, and by airplane not only the entire boundary line of the United States so as to have first-hand information as regards border patrol, but the needs of steamboat inspection and coast survey work, the needs of the Federal reformatories, the problems of Alaska and other outlying possessions, and many other of the Government's activities. All the items for this work came before the subcommittee. They normally elicit a thousand pages of hearings. This year the testimony crowds 1,200 pages.

By reason of the great care that Subchairman SHREVE manifests on all occasions, a full picture is secured of the departmental activities for all who desire to read the hearings built up by the appearance and testimony of those who justify the amounts which have been suggested by the Budget for the conduct of the various bureaus.

I shall not, of course, trespass upon the ground that the other members of the committee have discussed, but as I have been graciously permitted this time I shall call attention to a few items in which I have become interested.

Since 1922 we have enjoyed practically uninterrupted prosperity. In 1926 our national income reached \$89,000,000,000. This amount is an increase of 33 per cent over 1920. What the figures for 1927 shall be can only be estimated at this time, but it appears that on the whole the average will be maintained and the outlook for 1928 is most promising and high authorities are so optimistic that it would seem to border on the fantastic to quote them. There is but one factor which may tend to lower it, and the President referred to it in his message to this Congress.

He said, after pointing out that—

The country as a whole has had a prosperity never exceeded—

That—

Some parts of agriculture and industry have lagged; some localities have suffered from storm and flood. But such losses have been absorbed without serious detriment to our great economic structure.

My opinion as the reason we were able to absorb these losses without any serious effects is because of existing conditions reared upon fundamentally sound principles both as to Government and individual enterprise, the continuance of the protective tariff, and the abstention of the Government in business.

This bill, perhaps more than any other, appropriates money which is to be used in protecting, maintaining, and strengthening our economic structure through cooperation with agencies of production and industry in general.

It is of this cooperation and the accomplishments and achievements which have flowed from it in the past that I would like to speak. My remarks must necessarily be only on some of the more outstanding instances. The field is so broad and the activities so diversified that to go into all of them would consume much more time than I have at my disposal.

Before getting into the explanation, or citation, if you please, of these activities, I would ask you to keep in mind and associ-

ate very largely with them the satisfactory condition of the American public. It is estimated there are 28,000,000 families in the United States, and that 13,000,000 of them own their homes. This represents a huge investment on the part of the home owners and those who have houses for renting purposes. The conservation of this property is not by any means the least of our responsibilities as legislators, and it can best be done by keeping our country prosperous and at peace. The living standards of the people, the character of their homes, depend in no small measure on the smooth functioning of a great group of related industries.

One of the great bureaus in the Department of Commerce is that of the Bureau of Standards, which was established as a branch of the Treasury Department by the act approved March 3, 1901. It was transferred to the Department of Commerce and Labor upon the establishment of that department in 1903. The organic act provided for the purchase of a site for the bureau and the erection of laboratories. Under this authority a site of 8 acres was selected on Connecticut Avenue, and two laboratories now known as the North and South Buildings were constructed. From time to time Congress has appropriated funds for additions to the site and for additional laboratories until now the bureau's grounds have a total of about 43 acres, and its plant consists of 10 major and 7 minor buildings. In addition, a power-plant building is under construction, which it is expected will be completed by next spring. The personnel of the bureau has grown from 14 in 1901 to 839 in 1927.

One of the basic functions of the Bureau of Standards is to establish and maintain the national standards of quantitative measurement. The bureau is the custodian of the country's official standards of measurement. When necessary it constructs, tests, and calibrates new standards, and compares the measuring apparatus used in scientific investigations, and in engineering, manufacturing, and commerce, with the official standards. The statutes authorize the bureau to conduct scientific investigations of problems connected with the development and application of standards, and to determine the properties and characteristics of different materials, such as the thermal expansion of dental materials; the fluidity of lubricating oils; the melting point of metals; the boiling point of liquids; the conductivity of insulating materials; the tensile strength of steel; and the like. Generally speaking, this work is limited to data which are of urgent importance to scientific or manufacturing interests and are not readily obtainable elsewhere. While there is invariably an immediate and practical objective, yet facts and principles are often discovered which are of great value as contributions to the general fund of scientific knowledge.

Essentially the Bureau of Standards is a scientific and technical laboratory for service to the industries of the country and the various departments of the Government. Some 350 specialized scientists trained in physics, chemistry, and engineering are at work on problems involving the quality of materials and the testing of the commodities of commerce. According to information given me by Dr. George H. Burgess, the Director of the Bureau of Standards, in making a tour of inspection of the bureau's buildings one is impressed with the number of completely equipped small-scale manufacturing plants which form part of the facilities of many of the sections. Thus, in the metallurgical division will be found a foundry, heat-treating plant, rolling mill, forging press, wire-drawing outfit, and so forth. The textile section includes a complete cotton mill, the paper section has everything necessary for producing paper of any kind in sheets up to 25 inches wide, the rubber section has its mill and vulcanizing plant, and the leather section its miniature tannery. The glass section is particularly noteworthy, because here will be found one of the finest plants for producing optical glass in the United States. In this particular case the laboratory is of necessity a production plant, for it is only by making optical glass in considerable quantities that the difficult technique can be improved.

After inspecting these plants the visitor realizes that it is often necessary for the laboratory workers to turn plant superintendent. The question, then, naturally arises, how successful is the scientific man when he takes up the problems of manufacturing?

The work of the Bureau of Standards may help us to answer this question. Let us review briefly the recent accomplishments of some of the scientific sections, beginning with optical glass. I am informed that prior to 1914 not one pound of optical glass was made in the United States. Although we had some of the finest lens makers in the world, they had all worked with foreign glass. When the war came our supply of this essential material was cut off and several laboratories in this country started research work, with the object of learning to make

optical glass. Among these laboratories was the Bureau of Standards.

The bureau started this investigation in what was then its Pittsburgh laboratory. The whole process from the raw materials to the finished product had to be worked out, because the foreign glassmakers had already jealously guarded their secrets. Even the process of making the refractory crucibles or pots in which the materials are melted had to be developed. In this work the bureau cooperated with other research laboratories and with glass-making plants, and as the result of these cooperative efforts, a good grade of optical glass was turned out by 1917, when the United States entered the war.

The glass section of the bureau has been making optical glass ever since. During the fiscal year 1927 approximately 21,000 pounds of glass of four different kinds were made, and 21,441 lens blanks of various sizes were turned over to the optical shop of the Navy Department to be used in the construction of instruments. In 1923 a 12-inch telescope objective of 12½ feet focal length was made, the entire work from melting the raw ingredients to figuring the lens having been done by the bureau. Last May an even more ambitious piece of work was started. At that time there was cast by a special process a glass disk for reflecting telescope. The disk measures 70 inches in diameter and is 12½ inches thick. At the present time it is in a specially constructed annealing furnace where it is being slowly cooled and from which it will not be removed till next February. Of course, it is impossible to state at this time whether the job will prove a success, but if so, it will be a piece of work the like of which has never been attempted in this country and which has been successfully accomplished but a few times abroad. In this case a scientific bureau may be said to have set the pace for the regular manufacturers.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TILSON. Has any of this optical glass been sold to the public?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I understand that 21,000 of the lens blanks have been turned over to the optical shop of the Navy Department.

For some time the bureau has been studying the properties of high-speed steels used for making cutting tools. An important part of the work is a study of the effect of various impurities on the performance of the finished tool. In order to secure results of any value it is necessary first to make up other tools containing known kinds and amounts of impurities. The whole process of manufacturing high-speed tools is a difficult one, and commercial toolmakers insist that this grade of steel can only be produced after long experience and with a specially equipped plant. Nevertheless the Washington Navy Yard and the bureau working together have made quantities of high-speed tools, beginning with raw materials and ending with the tool ready for service. In tests of the tools on actual lathes, turning up heavy forgings in the Naval Gun Factory, the Government-made tools have stood up as well as any commercial tools on the market. Of course, the Bureau of Standards has no intention of going into the steel business, but when it had to make tools in order to conduct an important investigation it was able to do the job in a thoroughly satisfactory manner.

Very pure platinum is needed in many lines of work at the bureau. This is melted and purified by special processes, drawn into wire, and spun into crucibles. So successful has this work been that the bureau is in possession of platinum much purer than any that can be bought from regular dealers; in fact such impurities as are present exist in such small amounts that they can only be detected by means of the spectroscope. Chemical analysis will not reveal them.

While on the subject of metallurgy it should be remembered that the bureau operates a small foundry, where many special castings are made for the bureau's instrument shop and even for other branches of the Government. As in other fields the bureau does not expect to compete with commercial foundries, but it takes up work which they are not at all anxious to attempt. Many peculiar alloys and very pure metals are handled, and in practically all cases valuable data are secured on the behavior of metals and on foundry practice.

During the war munitions were made in hundreds of plants scattered all over the country. In order to have all the pieces fit together at the point of assembly it was necessary to use a great many standard gauges for controlling the dimensions of machined parts. The shop gauges, in turn, had to be based on precise master standards, known as gauge blocks. Up till the time of the war all the gauge blocks in use were produced by a single firm in Sweden. Naturally, the supply ran short, and



a serious situation was impending when the bureau came to the rescue. An Army officer, Major Hoke, developed at the bureau a special process for making these blocks far more quickly and cheaply than ever before. A shop was fitted up in one of the buildings equipped with special machinery, and soon American-made gauge blocks were available for the military services and for ordnance manufacturers. Many sets were made by the bureau, and, in addition, the method was turned over to American toolmakers, who were able to supply a satisfactory product on a commercial basis.

Portable metal spraying plants were developed and constructed by the bureau for the Navy Department and the process was brought to a practical point and was actually used in several different ways.

As we mentioned at the start, the bureau has always cooperated closely with manufacturers, and whenever possible it has not only experimented with production on a small scale in its semicommercial plants but has secured the cooperation of industries to try out the processes under commercial conditions. An interesting illustration of what may be accomplished by this kind of cooperative work is found in the dextrose industry.

For over 40 years the corn-products industries sought to discover a commercially practicable method for producing chemically pure glucose, a white crystalline product similar in appearance to granulated sugar. Some sort of a pure, cheap carbohydrate food, similar to sugar but without its sweetening power, was greatly needed in the condensed milk, ice cream, baking, and other industries. As the result of a long series of laboratory experiments, followed by experience in a semicommercial plant, the bureau discovered how to crystallize pure dextrose from its water solution. The commercial success of the project was known to hinge on this accomplishment. The bureau secured the cooperation of a manufacturer and sent a member of its staff to a large sugar refinery, where at the first attempt he succeeded in throwing down 4,000 pounds of pure dextrose. This first successful production took place only a little more than four years ago. To-day several million dollars are invested in dextrose refineries in this country and abroad. During 1926 this industry produced over 200,000,000 pounds of crystalline dextrose, valued at about \$10,000,000.

It is also believed that there are great possibilities for the recovery of gums, sugars, and cellulose from the waste products of the farm. A preliminary survey has been made in the fields of cotton, peanuts, and cornstalks. The bureau has several tons of cornstalks on hand at the Iowa Agricultural College

and expects to begin at once the processing of these stalks. Chemical work on peanut shells has demonstrated what conditions are best for hydrolysis of shells and has produced a mixture of organic acids, which is now being analyzed.

Wall board has been made from the insoluble residue. Cotton burrs and cottonseed hulls have been analyzed by regular methods of organic analysis and the bureau is now analyzing the constituent parts—fat, crude fiber, and ash.

Many other examples of what has been accomplished when a scientist turns manufacturer might be given, but the ones cited prove what can be done along this line. They could be duplicated by consulting the records of many other research laboratories within and outside the Government service.

So far as the Bureau of Standards is concerned, it does not claim to have accomplished these successful results in the manufacture of materials single handed. It has been greatly helped by the cooperation of the industries themselves. It does believe, however, that the laboratory man with an unprejudiced point of view has often been able to suggest improvements that have escaped the notice of those concerned purely with the commercial side of the work, and has been able to demonstrate the value of scientific theories by applying them to actual production methods.

Just here I would like to discuss a matter in connection with the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The bureau had prepared for me a statement showing a comparison of exports and imports for the last six and a half years, with the yearly average of postwar years, using the value of the dollar at the present time at 66½ cents, in order to bring the value of the postwar dollar to that of the pre-war dollar. I insert this table and call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the postwar period from January 1921, to June 30, 1927, there were \$4,486,226,000 yearly average worth of exports for that period. The exports to the 12 principal countries comprising 63 per cent of our entire exports, or \$2,787,173,000—and valued at \$1,858,117,000 at 66½ cents per dollar, as compared with the pre-war average from 1910 to 1914, were 17 per cent greater than the pre-war average exports.

The 12 countries referred to are the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Canada.

Our imports, using the same postwar average and the value of the dollar and the pre-war average, shows that they have increased 7 per cent, thus showing that trade does increase as far as imports are concerned, even though the protective tariff is alleged to hamper imports.

Comparison of exports and imports of yearly average for six and one-half postwar years with yearly average for prewar years, using 66½ cents as the value of a postwar dollar

	Exports			Per cent change from prewar average to postwar average dollar valued at 66½ cents		Imports			Per cent change from prewar average to postwar average dollar valued at 66½ cents	
	Postwar average January, 1921, to June 30, 1927	Value at 66½ cents	Prewar average 1910-1914			Postwar average January, 1921, to June 30, 1927	Value at 66½ cents	Prewar average 1910-1914		
				Increase	Decrease				Increase	Decrease
Total.....	\$4,486,226,000	\$2,990,817,000	\$2,165,818,000	38	-----	\$3,662,387,000	\$2,441,591,000	\$1,688,874,000	45	-----
	2,787,173,000	1,858,117,000	1,583,351,000	17	-----	1,374,198,000	916,132,000	852,690,000	7	-----
United Kingdom.....	940,743,000	627,162,000	567,592,000	10	-----	359,314,000	239,542,000	278,897,000	14	-----
Germany.....	383,164,000	255,443,000	304,098,000	16	-----	146,555,000	97,703,000	176,462,000	45	-----
Belgium.....	109,489,000	72,903,000	53,117,000	37	-----	62,170,000	41,447,000	40,360,000	3	-----
France.....	250,170,000	173,447,000	138,841,000	25	-----	149,189,000	96,459,000	130,130,000	24	-----
Italy.....	176,073,000	117,382,000	65,966,000	78	-----	84,808,000	56,539,000	51,149,000	11	-----
Greece.....	16,059,000	10,706,000	873,000	1,126	-----	23,064,000	15,376,000	3,329,000	362	-----
Netherlands.....	137,479,000	91,653,000	104,575,000	12	-----	76,516,000	51,011,000	34,937,000	46	-----
Denmark.....	45,034,000	30,023,000	15,393,000	95	-----	5,815,000	3,877,000	2,957,000	49	-----
Norway.....	27,217,000	18,145,000	7,819,000	132	-----	19,809,000	13,206,000	8,086,000	63	-----
Sweden.....	39,897,000	26,598,000	10,033,000	165	-----	36,263,000	24,175,000	9,630,000	154	-----
Canada.....	651,848,000	434,505,000	315,044,000	38	-----	410,695,000	273,797,000	117,213,000	134	-----
Ratio:										
Exports..... per cent.....	0.63	-----	0.73	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Imports..... do.....	.38	-----	.50	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Increased protection against invasion of our domestic markets by certain classes of foreign goods is essential. We must assist our producers to find an increased sale for their goods at home as well as abroad. We should insist on American materials being used by the Government at all times, the prices and quality being the same. Other nations have sent commissions here to study conditions, to learn more about our products, our processes, and methods, to the end that they may profit by our experiences. We are getting stiffer competition from foreign manufacturers and must be prepared to meet it.

Because standards of living in America are higher than in other parts of the world, production and distribution costs are relatively higher. To help maintain the present volume of this

country's export sales efforts need be extended toward increasing the demand abroad for articles manufactured here.

The British have done some notable work along this line, expending, according to a statement of an official of the British Government, more than £20,000 sterling for the translation, printing, and distribution of publications in Spanish, French, Italian, and Portuguese extolling the virtues of British-made goods. At the time this statement was made a campaign was launched to set aside some £50,000 to continue the work on a broader scale.

We, in our Department of Commerce, have doubled our appropriations as a whole, the appropriation in 1922 being \$17,262,060 and in 1928, \$36,627,450. In this estimate for last year and the

coming one is an appropriation for investigations designed to discover uses for waste farm products, to which I alluded when discussing the Bureau of Standards.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce maintains local offices in 23 cities—

Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Des Moines, Galveston, Houston, Jacksonville (Fla.), Kansas City, Louisville, Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, Mobile, New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Portland (Oreg.), St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, Wilmington (Del.).

These offices give aid and advice to the business interests in their respective communities in connection with sales and export problems, when necessary, of course, referring inquiries to the bureau at Washington. They also serve as distributing centers for bureau publications, seeking to place trade information directly in the hands of the persons most vitally interested. Through the cooperation of the local chambers of commerce offices are also maintained, practically without expense to the Government, at 34 important cities, making 57 offices in all. The bureau's sales information reports have grown from 11,684 inquiries in 1921 to 65,970 inquiries in 1926, an increase of over 550 per cent.

The item in this bill for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is \$4,162,357, while in 1919 it was only \$554,120, a 700 per cent increase. Compare this with the amounts appropriated by other governments for trade-promotive activities and governmental aids to manufacturers and exporters:

France, 24,202,096 francs—\$968,000.  
Canada, \$575,000—\$575,000.  
Union of South Africa, £25,000—\$125,000.  
Italy, 4,000,000 lira—\$200,000.  
Japan, 1,961,923 yen—\$980,000.

Aside from its purely trade and commerce activities in the generally accepted sense of those terms, the Department of Commerce has under its control far-flung agencies for the protection of navigation, according to information furnished me by the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Col. E. Lester Jones.

This survey has been rendering public service of tremendous practical importance for the past 111 years. Year by year both the volume and the importance of this service increases and, coincident with this, more and more efficient and economical methods are devised in order to keep pace with the increased demands made upon the bureau by the public.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey is charged with producing charts of the coastal waters of the United States and its possessions for the aid and protection of shipping entering our ports. These charts are indispensable to commerce, to economic development, and to the flow of commodities. As commerce increases, the demand for maritime charts and for the nautical publications of the bureau increases in direct proportion.

During the past year this bureau produced 246,836 charts—an increase of about 15,000 over the preceding year. This was the largest production for any year in its history with the exception of the period of the World War when, of course, the demand was unprecedented. Efficiency and economy of operation are strikingly emphasized in the fact that last year almost as many charts were produced as during the war, and yet the bureau was operating with less than its normal personnel in its chart division.

During 1927 the bureau increased its output of nautical publications very materially over the previous year. The distribution of its Coast Pilots, for example, showed an increase of 24 per cent, while the distribution of its Current Tables showed an increase of 26 per cent.

These increases are tangible evidence not only of national prosperity, as reflected in commercial growth, but also that the Coast and Geodetic Survey is doing its full share in promoting that prosperity.

In addition to its production of maritime charts, this bureau also has charge of executing control surveys in the interior of the country. It has been so successful in this branch of its work that it is internationally recognized as the greatest geodetic organization in the world. Its geodetic or control surveys are necessary in making all detailed surveys and topographic maps. They are indispensable in engineering projects, road building, and power development. Undertaken primarily for the purpose of checking the accuracy of nautical charts, the geodetic work of the bureau has developed to the point where engineers and surveyors everywhere are making extensive use of it in their local projects. As one single example of the importance of this work, no comprehensive plan of water-power development or flood control is feasible until after the Coast and Geodetic Survey or some other agency has executed the necessary leveling surveys.

One of the outstanding accomplishments of the past year was the hydrographic survey work done along the coasts of Oregon and Washington and in southeastern Alaska, where three of the survey's ships surveyed an area of 6,500 square miles during a season of about seven months. This unusual feat was made possible through the use of modern survey ships and through using a new echo sounding apparatus developed during the past two years by a number of cooperating agencies of which the survey was one of the most active.

This apparatus measures ocean depths in terms of time required for a sound wave to travel from near the surface of the water to the bottom of the ocean and be echoed back to the ship. After extensive experiments and tests the apparatus has been perfected to the point where it was used with the greatest success during the past year.

With this apparatus it is possible to survey more than twice as much area per day as would be possible by any other means. Thus the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been able to double its output on this class of work, and since no more expense is involved the unit cost of the work is cut squarely in two.

While the primary purpose of developing this apparatus was to speed up hydrographic surveys, the bureau has made an important contribution to mariners everywhere by its participation in development work along this line. This apparatus is useful not only in survey work but also to help vessels to locate their position at any time in thick weather. Safety at sea has thus been enhanced and the survey has added another chapter to its history of promoting the safety of maritime travel.

There has been of late years a decided increase in the demand for tide and current surveys of important harbors adjacent to metropolitan centers. Any survey of this character is of decided value to the mariner, who must have accurate knowledge of the effect of currents on his ship. Of equal or perhaps even more importance is the value of such surveys to engineers who are concerned with problems of sewage disposal, harbor improvements, bridge construction, and so forth.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has already made tide and current surveys of New York Harbor, San Francisco Harbor, Delaware Bay and River, Boston and Portsmouth, and southeastern Alaska. During the past year such a survey was inaugurated of Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. During the present year it is hoped to finish this survey.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has also designed one of the most wonderful machines devised by man—the tide-predicting machine. By the simple setting of a number of wheels and dials, the turning of the crank foretells the times and heights of high and low waters at any place in the world and for any year, past or future. As an indication of the progress which the survey is continually making it is interesting to note that recently this machine has also been adapted to the prediction of currents in important waterways and harbors, likewise of great value to the mariner.

An added duty of the bureau, imposed upon it during the past year, is the production of airway strip maps for aviators. With the development of commercial aviation, this service will be of increasing value to the people. The problem of the aviator is in large measure the same as the problem of the navigator, and although the duty of producing airway maps has added to the already heavy burdens of the survey it was inevitable that the pioneer chart-making agency of the Government should be delegated to perform this important duty.

These are some of the high spots in the service which the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the oldest scientific bureau in the Government, is rendering to the people of the United States. It has the confidence and respect of the public, and it is ever striving to so maintain its service that it will continue to be worthy of that confidence and respect.

The Bureau of Lighthouses is another "off-land" function performed by the Department of Commerce. During the past year the great Mississippi River flood placed an extra load on this business. In April and May the vessels and men of the Lighthouse Service cooperated in rescue work and made a notable record in maintaining the lights in their charge under great difficulties.

According to information given me by the Director of the Bureau of Lighthouses, at the end of the year 1926 the Lighthouse Service was maintaining a total of 18,363 aids to marine navigation. Although nearly 1,000 new aids were established during the year, the discontinuance of aids is kept under investigation as the original necessity for their maintenance ceases. Consequently 700 aids of various classes were discontinued during the year, making a net increase of 273 aids for the year. Of the total, 6,577 are lighted and 9,054 are floating.



There were 1,286 miles of airways lighted during the year, and work on 694 additional miles of airways was under contract. The total number of airway aids in commission was 755, including 616 aids formerly maintained by the Post Office Department on the transcontinental airway, which was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce on July 1, 1927.

Among the improvements in aids to marine navigation which have been made during the year the following may be mentioned: Eighty-one lights were changed from fixed to flashing, giving them a much more distinctive character; the illuminant of 7 lights was changed to incandescent oil vapor; also 80 lights (including 15 buoys) were changed to acetylene; and 13 lights changed to electric, producing a considerable increase in brightness. In addition to the 12 radiobeacons already mentioned, 17 sound fog signals were either established or improved for providing more powerful apparatus.

Progress has been continued in the establishment of automatic lights. During the year 54 new lights of this character were established, and 28 lights were changed from attended to automatic. The total number of automatic lights in the Lighthouse Service at the end of the year was 2,033, not including some partially automatic, and consisting of 1,203 lights on fixed structures and 830 lights on buoys. Also there are at present 14 automatically operated fog bells in service.

Upward of 90 instances were reported during the year where members of the Lighthouse Service effected rescues or aided vessels or persons in distress. Many of these acts were especially meritorious and at great personal risk to the lighthouse employees, and in such cases the employees concerned were individually commended by the Secretary of Commerce. A gold medal was awarded by the Secretary of the Treasury to the captain of the lighthouse steamer *Columbine* in recognition of gallant conduct in rescue work near San Juan Harbor, P. R. The keepers of a lighthouse on the Oregon coast were commended for heroic conduct in the rescue and first-aid treatment of a young man who had fallen over a cliff, 80 feet to the rocks below, and was seriously injured. The scene of the accident was 2 miles from the lighthouse and had to be reached at night by a narrow trail, 8 to 12 inches wide, along the face of the rock cliff above the surf.

According to information from the Patent Office, during the fiscal year 1927 there were 89,360 applications for patents, reissues, and designs received. In addition to 17,503 trade-mark applications, as well as 3,550 applications for renewal of trade-mark registrations, 3,370 label and print applications, 208,841 amendments to patent applications, 6,569 amendments to design applications, and 23,757 amendments to trade-mark, label, and print applications were applied for. These are only a part of the bureaus under the Department of Commerce. Much could be said about the others and the public services they are rendering.

Just at this time the public is much interested in aeronautics because of the great achievements of Colonel Lindbergh and our other airmen. In nearly all of the notable and history-making flights the aviators had the assistance of the Bureau of Aeronautics as well as the Bureau of Standards and more indirectly the radio division.

The Bureau of the Census is one with which the public has been acquainted for generations, and its publications carry a wonderful amount of information, statistical and otherwise, on nearly every phase of human endeavor.

The Bureau of Fisheries, the Bureau of Navigation, the Steamboat Inspection Service, and the Bureau of Mines are other agencies functioning for the well being and safety of the public.

Further time does not permit of going into all the interesting details of these bureaus but, if anyone has the time to peruse even a portion of the hearings, in my opinion, the opportunity will have been employed to their advantage. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the Greek refugee settlement provision.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LEHLBACH). The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, when in Athens last summer I went through one of the large Greek settlements where refugees have been brought back from Turkey. About 1,400,000 Greeks in all were brought back, and something over \$50,000,000 to date expended by the commission. To show how coincidences may

occur, within an hour I received a letter from the president of the commission, Mr. Charles B. Eddy, the first communication I have had from him for six months, in which he says that they have had a settlement in Geneva of the American claims with Greece and that \$12,000,000 additional has been loaned by the American Government for the use of Greek refugees.

It is not possible for all Members of Congress to visit countries of Europe that are still suffering from the effects of the World War or from general economic depression. It is equally impossible at long range fully to comprehend conditions in those countries, both internal and external.

Expense, time, and lack of opportunity generally prohibits us from getting such information first hand, but I believe in no other way can a reasonably clear understanding of European problems be reached. It is especially true of some of the smaller countries and of those not ordinarily visited by the tourist. Four years ago I spent several months in Russia, Poland, Georgia, and Armenia, off the beaten path, and last summer I visited as far south and east as Greece and Turkey and as far north as Trondjhem, in the Arctic Circle. In no other way can one learn from personal knowledge just how others live.

Their problems, their aspirations, and their future is of great moment to them and often to us. Generally speaking, the southern countries of Europe have not yet forgotten the World War. More gaily uniformed soldiers wearing swords and side arms were seen on the streets of Belgrade, Yugoslavia, during my brief visit in that country than would be found in all American cities combined in a year's time. At Bulgaria's border, when crossing over from Turkey, soldiers with fixed bayonets marched on either side of our car while their customs officers went through the train looking for trouble and trouble makers. These people have not yet recovered from the last war, yet peace seems farther removed than a quarter of a century ago. New boundaries made by the Versailles treaty have not brought peace.

Hatreds, jealousies, and fears dating back for centuries can not be smothered when on all sides people of suspicious nationalities patrol the borders between neighboring nations, but after such trips we discover that these people of Europe, who help make up our American civilization, when thrown into the melting pot on this side of the Atlantic become strong citizens.

In Greece the precious passport I held was inspected by five different functionaries, from deck hands to fierce-looking descendants of the men who once whipped Xerxes. This occurred before we were allowed to pass through the gates of Piræus, the port of Athens.

It is not my purpose to attempt a prosaic account of European travels even in the outlying districts, because many Members have felt the call in the past and others will cover the same ground in the future, possibly far more profitably, but I desire briefly to express the gratitude every American must feel toward American ambassadors, ministers, and consuls in Europe who make it possible for us to see and learn things first-hand. Overrun with American tourists, undoubtedly they individually and collectively sigh for respite, but I wish to record my appreciation of the kindness and courtesies invariably extended by our diplomatic and commercial representatives in every country visited and for their active aid in meeting foreign officials. Even foreign officials, who are long-suffering because of drafts made upon their time, with rare exceptions were always courteous and helpful.

Any one of a dozen of the countries visited would afford a text for remarks affecting present conditions, political and economic, but I am leaving that task for others better able to perform, while I submit a few brief observations regarding a sorely distressed country that over 20 centuries ago was a world center.

The American Government and the Greek Government are both fortunate to have at this time a resident official in Athens with the unusual experience and ability of American Minister Skinner. I believe he is the oldest American diplomatic official in length of service in the State Department. That in itself would be a guarantee of ability to handle successfully the many complex and perplexing problems that beset the Greeks and our relations with that country. In like manner, Gardner Richardson, our commercial attaché, is an unusual representative, whose efforts have largely increased trade relations between the two countries. These Americans and others are seeking to aid the Greek Government through its officials to meet present economic difficulties, complicated with political disturbances, that confront that people to-day. One of its stupendous problems relates to an army of over 1,000,000 refugees.

Every Greek refugee settlement is now caring for many thousands of refugees who suffered from Turkish persecutions, and this work, under the League of Nations, is now handled by a capable commission headed by Charles B. Eddy, president, an American. The Greek problem is one of vast magnitude because of lack of resources to meet the demands made by the situation and the innumerable difficulties that have beset those handling the relief work.

Before studying the Greek Government's refugee situation I called at the Near East relief headquarters at Athens, where help, though necessarily extremely limited in character, is being given to Greek orphans. Previously, four years ago, I had been through Near East relief work over in the Caucasus at Tiflis, Georgia, and also at Alexandropol down in Armenia, where 12,000 little orphans were paraded that day for us, dressed in their best clothes, a fine body of children who exhibited by their appearance the care and self-help instruction given by their American teachers. Domestic science and manual training were popular courses down in Armenia. In Kiev and elsewhere we visited Jewish relief work and in Moscow the Friends have a strong organization that affords relief to thousands of needy Russians. All these combined, however, make little impression compared with the Greek relief problem because of the latter's immensity and the additional fact that a vast army of refugees of all ages, sexes, and conditions must be cared for until they can become self-sustaining.

Only through an extensive organization, financed and managed by a great community fund necessarily advanced by outside governments, could this Greek relief work be successfully accomplished. Much more needs to be done and pressing demands will continue for a long time to come but to the splendid members of the organization who everywhere responded willingly and cheerfully is due the grateful thanks of the world that is interested in this fine humanitarian work. I say this at the outset because what little I have to offer, based on my own personal examination, is unqualifiedly in commendation of the relief work now in the hands of the League of Nations. By its extension of credit like that previously given to Austria and other countries the league secured loans for the Greek Government from English and American sources aggregating upward of \$50,000,000, and this sum for which the already heavily burdened government is responsible is a fund that has kept hundreds of thousands of Greek refugees from starvation.

I do not intend to discuss massacres, murders, and other violence alleged to have been practiced by the Turks against the Greeks which have a basis of fact according to fairly trustworthy evidence. There are controverted issues, however, wherein it is alleged in Turkey that both Greeks and Turks were responsible for what occurred in Smyrna and elsewhere. After discussing the matter briefly with various people in Constantinople, including Turkish and American officials, with Admiral Bristol and others, I am satisfied that two sides may be presented in any case of the Greeks against the Turks, but it is not so important now to determine the degree of responsibility for what occurred at Smyrna or elsewhere. The work of giving protection and aid to Greek refugees is an outstanding problem that has aroused the sympathy of the world, and it is that splendid work to which I would briefly refer.

To the average person modern Greece is assumed to be without any particular pride in its past or hope for the future. Yet students of history, of philosophy, and of the arts even in this material age find in Grecian history that which saved to us a higher civilization at a time when the world hesitated between progress and reaction. Its soldiers, sailors, statesmen, and philosophers once led the world.

In his recent illuminating story of philosophy, Durant recalls for us things well worth remembering when introducing his great characters with their surroundings. He says:

If you look at a map of Europe you will observe that Greece is a skeletonlike hand stretching its crooked fingers out into the Mediterranean Sea. South of it lies the great island of Crete from which those grasping fingers captured, in the second millennium before Christ, the beginning of civilization and culture. To the east across the Aegean Sea lies Asia Minor, quiet and apathetic now, but throbbing in pre-Platonic days with industry, commerce, and speculation.

To the west across the Ionian, Italy stands like a leaning tower in the sea and Sicily and Spain, each in those days with thriving Greek colonies; and at the end the Pillars of Hercules (which we call Gibraltar) that somber portal through which no ancient mariner dared to pass \* \* \*. Look at the map and observe the position of Athens; it is the farthest east of the larger cities of Greece. It was favorably placed to be the door through which the Greek passed out to the busy cities of Asia Minor and through which those elder cities sent their luxuries and their culture to adolescent Greece. It had an admir-

able port, Piræus, where countless vessels might find a haven from the rough water of the sea, and it had a great maritime fleet.

In 490-470 B. C., Sparta and Athens, forgetting their jealousies and joining their forces, fought off the effort of the Persians under Darius and Xerxes to turn Greece into a colony of an Asiatic empire. In this struggle of youthful Europe against the senile East, Sparta provided the army and Athens the navy \* \* \*. Thereafter Sparta relapsed into agricultural seclusion and stagnation while Athens became a busy mart and port, the meeting place of many races of men and of diverse cults and customs whose contact and rivalry begot comparison, analysis, and thought.

With this introduction the writer in the development of his subject explains why Greece, the center of commerce and culture became likewise the center of the world's philosophy, of science, art, and thought. Historians have depicted the glories of ancient Athens and the wealth and power of Greece. After more than a score of centuries we find that the once proud, powerful race that led the world is now a small, humbled people confronted with heavy burdens that might well stagger a great prosperous country. If we owe any debt to Greece, that a score of centuries ago blazed the way of progress, ours is the opportunity to recognize that fact and to meet such obligation in this twentieth century of world prosperity which we enjoy.

Back in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C., when Athens was in the height of her glory, Agora was the center of that city, and of Grecian activities. Her temples, statuary, and paintings are described by historians to have been beyond comparison in that day and age. Buried far below the surface of the earth for centuries archaeologists have long attempted to bring to light evidences of those ancient glories.

Various countries have sought to join in the effort to recover these treasures, but after plans failed to materialize it remained for Americans to finance the scheme, and contracts have now been given to that end. The expense will reach several million dollars, and for years to come the attention of archaeologists the world over will be directed to these excavations to be conducted by Americans in the heart of Athens.

When I was there last summer arrangements were about completed, and these involved the removal of hundreds of homes and shops now standing in the area to be excavated. This work in itself is of outstanding importance to the little country that was once a world power, but the recovery of these relics and ancient remains to my mind is of far less value to the world than the saving of lives and upbuilding of over a million Greek refugees who have suddenly been thrust upon the war-exhausted mother country. Whether due to national hatred by the Turks, religious persecutions, or one of the extraordinary horrors of war, by whatever name called, the burning and massacres in Smyrna and persecutions in other parts of Turkey have brought to Greek shores within the last five years a vast horde of miserable, poverty-stricken creatures numbering over fourteen hundred thousand souls.

Their tale of suffering is one of the horrors of modern times. With that I shall not linger, but the story of their gradual regeneration is not so well known. That work, to my mind, is of infinitely more importance than the resurrection of all the buried temples of old Greece, for living temples are being rebuilt in that country to-day by hands outstretched from all over the world working under the direction of the League of Nations.

To indicate the size of the task I quote from a pamphlet published by the World Alliance at Athens, 1925. The indictment from Greek sources in one paragraph alleges:

During the World War the Turks "first stripped of all belongings and then deported 88,485 Greeks of Thrace, 144,559 of West Asia Minor, and 257,019 of Pontus. \* \* \* This half million of old men, women, and children driven across mountains and plains by Turkish gendarmes and harried at every step by brigands and bloodthirsty Turkish peasantry were practically wiped out by massacre, hunger, cold, and fatigue. \* \* \* The Greek Government lent its aid for the return of the deported population to their homes and for assistance toward their reestablishment. \* \* \* Of the 490,000 persons, 121,000 returned to their homesteads unassisted, while 15,000 more were repatriated through the aid of committees. There remained 355,000 deportees of whom no news could be obtained.

A long list of counts alleges many acts of cruelty, but the above charges have been briefly stated in order to indicate one phase of the problem rather than to set forth the causes that produced it.

The League of Nations through its officials undertook to relieve this distress and in a pamphlet of over 200 pages entitled "Greek Refugee Settlement (Geneva, 1926)" it briefly presents the task:

The problem presented by the influx of 1,400,000 Greek refugees into a country small in extent, whose population numbered approximately



5,000,000. \* \* \* On the humanitarian side imagination can not compass the event. Only those can understand who have seen destitution, misery, disease, and death in all their possible forms, and the scale of this disaster was so unprecedented as to demand even from such persons a new vision.

The League of Nations established the refugees settlement commission in 1923. When I was in Greece last summer I went through one of the settlements near Piræus, a few miles from Athens. We were accompanied by the Greek refugee settlement commission, including Charles B. Eddy, its president, an American citizen, Sir John Simpson, of England, and Mr. Pallis, a Greek citizen educated at Oxford.

These men who composed the commission were followed on our tour of inspection throughout the settlement by a throng of those whom they were seeking to relieve. Groups of men, women, and children welcomed them on every hand as we passed through the dirt hovels or small shacks built by the refugees. We visited the small frame hospitals, and the little crude homes where thousands yet to be provided for were huddled together, but dirt floors were swept, a homemade chair and table often seen, and so far as able to do so the inhabitants kept their places scrupulously clean. I believe about 50,000 refugees were in this one settlement, which was partially wiped out by a fire after we left last summer, but I was impressed by the evidences of self-help and gratitude expressed by this large city of persecuted poverty-stricken refugees.

Although the commission that accompanied us was greeted with warmth, the poverty and destitution of these refugees seen on every hand makes the problem of relief one not easily described nor comprehended. Orphans, little mothers, and feeble old people were noted everywhere. One of the most pathetic figures was a young mother, scantily dressed, sitting in a small hovel or "shack" about 8 feet square that seemed all the room and home she possessed. On the dirt floor of this "room" stood a box, and on the box rested a small, rough, wood coffin that held the remains of an infant. One small lighted candle at the head of the coffin was the mother's only company. A pitiful, cowering figure, she sat there with her dead and her grief. Scenes of sickness, suffering, and death are so common with these refugees that death has no terrors, but none of the wonderful paintings seen in all the galleries of Europe left to the mind such a lasting impression as that of the sorrowing mother in the hovel on a back street of the Piræus refugee camp. And that was only one of many sad scenes.

A pamphlet issued by the refugee commission dated Athens, May 25, 1927, about the time of our arrival, gives a brief description of the work carried on by the commission. Total expenditures to date had then reached £8,882,191 sterling, which with other items listed as assets set off against liabilities amounted to £10,895,238 to date or \$53,059,309 expended for relief work. The statement covering many pages with charts discloses the size of the task and character of relief afforded. Items with amounts advanced included advances for farmers, forage, agricultural implements, plowing animals, sheep and goats, horses, and numerous other items. Thirty-five districts received relief given to thousands of families in different districts who were given the minimum amount that would get them by with their pressing needs.

It sounds unimportant to say the town of Salonica now contains 170,000 town refugees in addition to its normal population or that Macedonia and Thrace have 300,000 refugees who are now receiving help from the commission; but after going with this serious-minded commission through passageways, often hardly a yard wide, between long rows of mud hovels, and then through the new districts, learning from observation their amazing accomplishments, I felt that in Christianizing labors that directly affect civilization, such work, performed by this splendid organization practically within the shadows of the world-famous acropolis, returns some reward to the people who once led the civilized world and, more than all, others made ours an enlightened world fit to live in.

No more than a pen picture of the problem can be offered here, but this refugee work marks a phase of the League of Nations activities little understood by the world at large. Second only to that discovery is the further fact that high-minded, capable men have been pressed into service who are gradually bringing order out of chaos and saving thousands of lives by their tireless energy.

To appreciate the size of the problem, let us suppose that in the United States after a long, disastrous war in which a large proportion of the male population had been killed, the country was suddenly called upon to absorb and provide for over 30,000,000 destitute people in an area about one-quarter the size of our own country and in a country that had been farmed in places for nearly 20 centuries.

Greece had approximately 5,000,000 inhabitants after the World War. The refugees concentrated in Greece during the last five or six years, according to the report, includes over 1,000,000 who came from Asia Minor, 190,000 from Eastern Thrace, 70,000 from the Caucasus, 70,000 from Constantinople, and 30,000 from Bulgaria.

Of the 1,400,000 Greek refugees landing in Greece during 1922 and 1923 a comparatively small number estimated at about 50,000 have left the country. A further number estimated around 175,000 have been absorbed by the local population of Athens and other towns, but those needing assistance, when we were there, according to estimates, numbered around 1,200,000 or 300,000 families of four persons each.

Attacking the problem of housing, the commission, acting for the League of Nations, aided by the Greek Government, built 22,337 houses, wooden huts, and hospital buildings by 1926. This number has since been increased, although the fire of 1927 destroyed a portion of the Greek refugee settlement near Athens.

To provide some means of self-support, the refugees have been given or sold on credit an extremely limited supply of seed, implements, cattle, and other supplies as stated. A limited budget prevents the commission from giving much needful aid, so that hardship necessarily continues to exist, but sickness with medical supplies and attendance was on a genuine relief scale when we were there. The hospitals were small, temporary, frame structures but clean and well conducted. Nurses were in attendance and, needless to say, they did not lack for patients.

From those engaged in relief work we learned that the reverence of the Greek for memories relating to his religion or his country is unexampled. No relic, no sanctuary, however ruined, is ever abandoned. There is no chapel, even if perched on the top of a high promontory to which he does not go at least once in the year to burn candles and to celebrate the feast of the Saint.

Although crushed by war and by dissensions that came from national disasters these Greeks are facing the future with confidence. Some of their Government officials stressed the necessity of additional loans that were needed in order to enable the Government to become rehabilitated.

Large new drainage and irrigation works have been undertaken by a company now operating in northern Greece, but promised loans, not yet realized, have halted much of the reconstruction that will enable the country to meet its responsibilities and to take its proper place among the family of nations. In this connection let me say the Greek officials handling the Government's finances are able men and have well maintained the Government's credit.

It was while in Greece that we first learned of floods in the Mississippi Valley. When our great, wealthy Nation is called on to cope with a flood disaster, the loss of life, reaching about 200, although serious, is slight in comparison with the frightful Greek calamity, and the disproportionate problem presented is apparent. Yet our home flood problem is nation-wide in its sympathy.

No minimizing of the Mississippi flood-control situation is needed to emphasize the stupendous size of the Greek refugees relief work. In our own case we have undertaken in a proper legislative way to cope with the situation, with unbounded resources to meet the situation. Our Government has generously aided Russia, Austria, Germany, and other peoples in recent years who have suffered from wars, famine, or other calamities. Grateful acknowledgments for such aid have come from officials of such governments speaking for their people, but in no country the world over, not even in what the propagandist terms "Darkest Russia" or desolated Armenia, will be found such destitute conditions as now exist in Greece, the once world-famous center of civilization. No dole system is possible from an impoverished Government, nor is that character of relief suggested by those conducting the relief work. Every effort is being exerted to aid pressing necessities and to make the refugees self-supporting.

In that service the oft-criticized League of Nations has taken up a humanitarian work that makes this agency the good Samaritan of Europe and to a limited extent a balance wheel in world affairs.

With these few words I have imperfectly attempted to describe the Greek problem that first of all requires immediate and constructive relief work for over a million people who have been thrown upon the homeland—a people destitute and helpless. That recovery and rehabilitation of the historic country carrying this heavy burden in addition to the effects of a disastrous war would discourage many people.

The Greeks have faced the situation with a courage and confidence that challenges the admiration of the world.

I attach a letter received January 5, 1928, which has a direct reference to the work of the commission and to the methods of financing that must occur to meet the needs of the refugee work. It was written by Chairman Eddy, of the commission, scarcely two weeks ago and gives a hopeful picture of meeting urgent need through the \$12,000,000 loan advanced by our own Government. The letter reads:

THE REFUGEE SETTLEMENT COMMISSION,  
Athens, December 22, 1927.

The Hon. JAMES E. FREAR,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FREAR: When I was in Geneva last June I gave instructions that there should be sent to you various publications relating to Greece and other reconstruction projects sponsored by the League of Nations. I hope these various documents were received and that you found them interesting.

I am writing now because of the great interest I take, as chairman of the refugee settlement commission, in the fact that an agreement has been reached by Greece with the Treasury Department relating to the settlement of the debt of Greece to the United States. As part of this settlement, it is provided that the sum of approximately \$12,100,000 will be advanced to Greece for use in completing the settlement of the refugees. It is particularly agreeable to me to know that one of the provisions of the agreement was that this sum should be spent by our commission.

I was in Geneva when the news of the settlement was received. Needless to say that it made a very strong and favorable impression upon all concerned.

The work of the commission has been proceeding since you were here, but naturally somewhat slowly, as the funds of the commission were near exhaustion. With the new credits which will be available from the United States loan and an additional £500,000 which will be available from a loan floated in the financial markets, it will be possible for the commission to make further progress with its work.

Hoping that you still retain your interest in this part of the world, and wishing you the compliments of the season, I am,

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES B. EDDY.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to become the spokesman for the Middle Western section of the country by quoting for the benefit of the Members of the House an editorial from the Omaha Bee-News of Saturday, December 24, 1927, dealing with the subject of the development and growth of river navigation and general internal improvements.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the Omaha Bee-News of Saturday, December 24, 1927, dealing with the subject of the development and growth of river navigation and general internal improvements, which is as follows:

#### MID WEST MUST BE ON GUARD

Now comes the flood control bill. As reported by the committee, it provides for the total cost to be paid out of national funds. The President in his message urged that one-fifth of the cost should be charged against the land to be benefited.

The resulting debate in Congress between these two points of view will inevitably bring into discussion the problem of the Panama Canal, inland waterway development, and irrigation in the semiarid lands of the West and Middle West.

The question first to be considered is:

"Why is there a flood problem in the lower Mississippi Valley?"

The answer is:

"Because cities and towns and farms are located on the natural flood plain of the great river. The river has been spreading out over that flood plain for ages, long before man came to build cities and towns and lay out farms. The people in these cities and towns and on these farms are defying nature when they build on the Mississippi flood plain. They have gone there with their eyes open, they know that the river overflows, but the land is so rich they have been willing to bear the cost of keeping the river back, keeping it within the levees they have built."

Then comes the great flood; the river climbs over the highest levees and inundates the cities and the towns and the farms that have been pushed out onto the flood plain—that have encroached upon the land that, since time immemorial, has periodically been covered by the Father of Waters.

Under the stress of the disaster following this last great flood those who have encroached upon the natural flood plain of the Mississippi River come to Congress demanding relief.

Stripped of the tragedy of the flood and of the losses that the flood brought with it, here is what the people of the lower Mississippi River demand:

"We have built our cities and our towns and located our farms right to the very edge of the river at low water. We have spent millions of dollars in building levees, yet every year we must build these levees higher. In spite of the millions we have spent, the river is still the master; the river still overflows the lowlands and drowns us out. We want the Nation to pay the cost of the battle from now on."

President Coolidge says that if these lowlands are valuable, if they are worth preserving, worth protecting, then the people who own these lands should at least pay for one-fifth of the cost of protecting them. The flood control bill now before Congress, as reported by the committee, provides that the people who own these lands shall pay nothing; that the people of the Nation shall pay it all.

Thus the issue is joined. The Omaha Bee-News has already called attention to this situation. What are we in the Middle West going to have to say about it? In the semiarid section of the Middle West, whenever water is put onto the land through irrigation, the people who own that land pay the entire cost of the project; they pay the entire cost of maintaining it. In the last analysis, what is the difference between the position of the man on an irrigated farm who wants water on his land and the man on a lowland farm who wants the water kept off?

The Representatives in Congress from the lower Mississippi States and from the semiarid regions of the Middle West must bear in mind that this flood control bill is destined to set a precedent. If it is right to tax the whole Nation for the entire cost of keeping water off the land—or, for that matter, to tax them for four-fifths of the cost—then the farmer on irrigated land has a right to demand the same thing for putting water on his farm—the principle must work both ways.

The Representatives from the Middle West will and should demand that the flood-control program include reservoirs on the upper reaches of the rivers that pour their waters into the Mississippi lowlands. These reservoirs are necessary to a real program of flood control.

In the arguments advanced by the Representatives from the southern Mississippi River States they call attention to the fact that at one time levees only 4 feet high sufficed to protect New Orleans from the floods, whereas to-day levees 60 feet high are needed in some sections. Thus the levee system has largely defeated itself through building up the bottom of the river and making higher levees necessary.

A real flood-control plan, therefore, calls for reservoirs on the upper Missouri and on the upper reaches of other tributary rivers to hold the floods back. Therefore, too, these reservoirs should be built out of funds taken from the National Treasury.

The Middle West agreed to tax itself for the building of the Panama Canal. The Middle West is now suffering from the low long-haul freight rates that the canal gives those living in the coast sections. As an offset to these rates the Middle West is demanding that the inland waterways system be completed as rapidly as possible, and that these inland waterways be paid for out of national taxation.

These two things offset each other. There is an agreement that the inland waterways be paid for out of the National Treasury. There should also be an agreement that the building of reservoirs shall be a part of the flood-control plan, and that these reservoirs be paid for out of national funds.

Any plan to saddle the cost of protecting the lowlands in the Mississippi River flood basin onto the Nation as a whole should be fought by Representatives of the Middle West unless those plans include reservoirs that shall also be paid for out of national funds.

Any other plan would mean the saddling of millions of dollars of the flood costs, as well as the saddling of the Panama Canal costs, on the Middle West, without any corresponding benefit to the people who live in the inland empire.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEHLBACH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8269) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### CONSERVATION OF FISHERIES RESOURCES

Mr. WHITEHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer for a moment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce, which includes the Bureau of Fisheries, and in that connection to insert an address delivered by the superintendent



of the bureau on June 6, 1927, at Independence, Va., on the conservation of our fishery resources. This address was not only very interesting but very instructive. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be inserted in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the address referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITEHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include the following address of Mr. E. C. Fearnow, of the United States Bureau of Fisheries, made at Independence, Va., June 6, 1927:

Mr. FEARNOW. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate the kind expressions just made by your chairman and your Congressman in regard to the work of the Bureau of Fisheries and am glad to see so much interest manifested by the people of this section of the Nation in the "conservation of our fisheries resources," about which I will speak to you this morning.

Virginia offers an excellent field for fish propagation and should be made into a paradise for the sportsman. You have the salt-water fishes and migratory species on the eastern coast, with natural breeding grounds for the large-mouth black bass, blue gill, and crappie. In the mountains of Carroll and Grayson Counties the waters are ideal for the cold-water fishes, such as brook trout and rainbow trout. The Shenandoah River is the home for the much-sought-for small-mouth black bass, while the headwaters of many of its tributaries offer a congenial environment for brook trout. As practically every Temperate Zone plant thrives in Virginia, thus permitting a diversity of crops, so do divers species of fish thrive in the waters of the State. Such a valuable natural asset should be developed to the limit. Mountain streams of 60° Fahrenheit, such as exist in Carroll and Grayson Counties, ought to be teeming with trout. What is the reason why the numerous plants of fish are not producing maximum results? In the first place, you need a system of conservation such as has been outlined, as no amount of fish planting can compensate for fish taken out of streams where promiscuous and indiscriminate fishing is allowed. In the second place, you need large-sized fish instead of fry. The Bureau of Fisheries has come to the conclusion that fry are not producing the best results, and in order to furnish large-sized fish it is cooperating with various organizations in the rearing of trout to the fingerling stage.

The Federal trout hatcheries are equipped for incubating large numbers of eggs, but they do not have the facilities for rearing young fish until they are 3 or 4 inches long. It is generally conceded that 4-inch fish have an excellent chance to survive, while a large number of the fry planted in streams inhabited by large fish simply serve as food for the predatory species.

The Bureau of Fisheries is trying to find means for rearing its output of trout to the fingerling stage and is asking organizations and individuals who have suitable sites for rearing fish to cooperate to the extent of furnishing sites and food for 10,000 to 40,000 trout until they are large enough to care for themselves in open waters. Many organizations throughout the country are now successfully rearing trout in nurseries on the cooperative basis. The fry are furnished by the Government during April or May free of charge. The organization rears them until October, when they are planted in near-by waters. The bureau furnishes an experienced fish culturist to give advice in regard to the care of the fish, and in October an employee experienced in fish distribution is sent to direct the planting of the output in suitable waters.

Cooperative trout nurseries are being considered at Galax, Independence, and Troutdale.

While nearly all fishes are remarkably prolific there is a great variation in this respect among the different species. For example, at the Federal fish hatchery at Neosho, Mo., a bream 1½ pounds in weight produced over 2,000 eggs and a 4-pound black bass about 9,000. At the Cape Vincent, N. Y., fish hatchery a 1½-pound yellow perch yielded 25,000 eggs and a normal-sized pike perch was found to contain 250,000. An 80-pound codfish spawned at one of the Federal fish hatcheries in Massachusetts produced 3,250,000 eggs, while instances have been recorded of the production of 9,000,000 eggs from a single cod of large size. The highest record for sturgeon appears to be 7,000,000 eggs.

In view of this great profusion it would seem to the uninitiated that the future of the fisheries might safely be left to work itself out by natural processes. As a matter of fact, however, the great waste which goes on in connection with other forms of life is greatly intensified among the fishes. If one-tenth of the fish eggs annually deposited were to result in fully matured fish there would be no need to resort to artificial methods for the conservation and improvement of our fisheries.

The first heavy drain upon the supply is immediately after the eggs have been deposited, as many of them never come in contact with the fertilizing medium and thus fail to develop. Others in enormous numbers are consumed by many enemies, including fish, crustacea, in-

sects, and birds. In view of the many vicissitudes to which the eggs are subjected at all stages of their development, it is not likely that more than 25 per cent of those deposited ever hatch. Further, it is estimated that of the fry produced not more than 25 per cent live to attain maturity, even in waters receiving adequate protection; and in the case of small streams and lakes where unrestricted fishing is allowed, especially seining and giggering, it is doubtful if even 1 per cent of the fry hatched in these waters ever survive to the age of maturity. Though powerful, the capacity of the waters for the production of fish life is not without limit, and we have been too prone to regard the fisheries of our country as a free for all harvest, reaping where nothing has been sown.

#### REASONS FOR DISAPPEARANCE OF FISH

In primeval times our streams were well stocked with desirable species of fishes, but the balance so admirably maintained by the unhindered working of natural laws has been destroyed by the activities attending civilized life. Before this country was settled, when Indians were the sole fishermen, they were satisfied to take only enough fish to fill immediate needs. There was then no thought of gain or of preserving the flesh and shipping it to distant points. With the rapid increase of the population all this has been changed, and especially since the automobile has been adopted as a common means of transportation, opening as it has to easy access and consequent depletion vast numbers of streams and lakes in all sections of the United States which a comparatively few years ago were regarded as inaccessible. The altered conditions and the increasing requirements of civilization are constantly making it more difficult to maintain good fishing in public waters.

The early settlers were driven by force of circumstances to pursue a policy of destruction, and this to a great extent explains the present scarcity of fish and game, as the conditions comprising a favorable environment for wild life had to be sacrificed. Timbered lands were converted into fields for the raising of crops, and with the destruction of the forests the water supply was so greatly reduced that many streams formerly favorable to trout and bass were thereby unfitted for the maintenance of desirable forms of fish life. In the cutting of the forests many lands were cleared that might to much better advantage have been left undisturbed, as their subsequent use for agriculture has demonstrated.

Many of our best streams have become so polluted through the discharge therein of refuse from manufacturing plants that game fish will no longer survive in them. High dams for hydroelectric plants have been built, excluding anadromous fishes from their natural spawning areas in the headwaters of coastal streams. Nets are laid out to the channels of rivers from either side, making it impossible for shad and herring to pursue their normally sinuous course upstream. There is also to be reckoned with the numerous individuals who fish the year around, including the spawning period, at which time fish are tame and can be easily caught. The catching of a bass during the breeding season may mean the loss of from 3,000 to 6,000 fry.

The conditions described demand prompt remedial action if we are to retain some of our more desirable species of fish. Though great, the difficulties to be overcome are not insurmountable. It would seem that the ingenuity which can plan a great dam might devise means for fish to pass over it. It would also seem that both the commercial fisherman and the angler might be taught to use without abusing the resources of our country. In keeping with our remarkable progress along commercial lines, we should see to it that our important aquatic life is protected. Up to this time the great difficulty has been that all available resources are applied to matters involving immediate pecuniary gain, leaving neither time nor attention to devote to the work of conservation.

Deforestation on a large scale has so changed the flow of our streams as to convert them into torrents during the season of heavy precipitation and into stagnant pools in the dry period of the year. It is plainly apparent that it will be necessary to adopt measures for holding back the waters of streams through the medium of the numerous lakes located on adjoining fish and game preserves, and also by reforesting the lands in the vicinity of their headwaters.

#### VALUE OF PROPAGATION WORK OVERESTIMATED

The delay in adopting constructive measures for the conservation of fish life is probably to be attributed largely to the discovery of the artificial method of propagating fish eggs. With means at hand for artificially hatching fish it has become the opinion of many that conservation work is superfluous; that every stream, lake, and pond would soon be teeming with fish as a result of the work done at the Federal and State hatcheries. There could be no greater mistake. While the importance of the discovery can not be disputed, experience has demonstrated beyond a doubt that artificial propagation, unaided, can not compensate for the large numbers of fish annually taken from our streams and lakes. Moreover, no method has yet been devised which will permit of the successful manipulation of eggs of such nest-building species as the black basses. In view of these facts it is apparent that a practical system of conservation will have to be adopted as an aid

in maintaining in our waters the salmons, trouts, basses, and other desirable species of fish. While the Federal Government and the States can furnish fish to serve as a brood stock, they can not hope to maintain good fishing by such means, but must have the active cooperation of organizations and individuals in protecting the fish placed therein. The public should not expect to catch fish that have been planted in their waters before they have had time to attain maturity and reproduce. Neither should it insist on the planting of fish in localities where the prevailing sentiment is unfavorable to the enforcement of adequate laws for the protection of fish and game.

It would, of course, be nice if the Government could keep plenty of fish in every body of water and they could be taken out whenever desired without any restrictions. It would also be convenient to have our farm yards and fields kept stocked with poultry and livestock by the Government. However, such paternalism is neither practicable nor in accord with American ideas. Although the Government does raise livestock, it is done with the sole view of improving the quality and it is never distributed indiscriminately. It would appear that certain individuals are prone to rely too much on the annual planting of fish and are losing sight entirely of the equally important work of protecting and conserving the stock already in the waters.

#### FISH CONSERVATION

It is recognized that it will always be necessary to propagate and distribute fish for maintaining the supply in public waters, but to insure efficient results from such work a system of fish conservation so thorough that it will go to the very root of the difficulties encountered at the present time should be put into practical operation; a system that will enlist the active cooperation of every association and every angler. It is generally understood that our waters are deficient in fish life; that many streams, owing to pollution, are unsuitable for the clear-water species; that migratory fishes are being excluded by high dams and other barriers from their natural spawning grounds; and that physical conditions of some streams have so changed in recent years that indigenous fishes no longer find in them a congenial environment.

The problem is to make two or more fish grow where only one is growing and, if possible, make them grow in waters where they do not now exist. Apparently the sportsmen are willing to assist in the execution of any feasible plan of fish conservation that may be adopted. The letters that have come in from different sections of the country indicate that they are impatient to begin work of rehabilitating overfished waters but are in doubt as to the proper course to pursue. The trouble seems to be that there is no system of conservation in operation that is generally acceptable to the extent that all organizations are willing to risk its adoption. The plan decided upon must be so simple and so clear as to make its feasibility self-evident.

In their efforts to solve the problem many sportsmen are suggesting fish hatcheries, having in mind the fish-cultural stations operated under Federal or State authority or by private management, where fish are either artificially hatched in troughs and jars or bred in a series of ponds under more or less natural conditions. Now, what is needed in the great majority of cases is not a hatchery with all its attendant problems, but the application of some practical method for conserving and multiplying the fish already in the waters. In a great many instances good advice is needed more than a stock of fish. Restocking should not be resorted to unless a state of almost actual depletion exists, and not then until the cause of the depletion has been ascertained and eliminated. So long as the basis of a brood stock exists in a body of water there is an opportunity to build up its fishing. It is an economic waste to permit adult fish to be caught promiscuously and depend solely on plants of small fish to maintain the supply. Such a procedure is like killing all the hens and depending upon the incubator to produce chickens, losing sight of the necessity of the mature fowls for the production of eggs. There can be no better time than the present to advocate the inauguration of some simple and effective method for conserving and increasing the supply of fish in public waters.

#### THE HABITS OF FISH

We know very little of the habits of fish, especially of such inland species as the bass and the bluegill. It would be a valuable aid to the conservationist to know whether or not fish travel great distances up or down stream, what influences them in such movements—whether it is the water temperature, the food supply, or some other cause. If it were a settled fact that fish planted at a given point in a stream would remain near that point under certain conditions we might strive to produce those conditions in fish refuges and feel confident that the fish placed in them would not wander far beyond the limits of the refuge. We should then be free to apply our energies to the raising of fish in streams without going to the expense of constructing inclosures for brood stock and could use the ponds that are too small to maintain food fish for the production of minnows to serve as a food supply for stocking the refuges.

A system of tagging fish similar to the method pursued in the work with salmon and the marine fishes might be successfully employed in studying the habits of fishes of our inland waters. Fingerling fish with

small tags clasped either to the dorsal or ventral fin are released at various places and a careful record made of the points of deposit. A few years afterwards rewards are offered for the tags with information as to where the fish bearing them were taken. The recovery of several hundred tags with data as to points of capture, the season of the year they were taken, and other relevant facts would furnish sufficient data on which to base scientific conclusions in the formation of a policy of fish conservation.

#### SURVEY OF STREAMS AND LAKES

In order to determine just what is needed to increase the supply of fish in any body of water the logical course to pursue is to conduct an ecological survey and thus be in a position to rectify any faulty condition of the water that may exist. It may be that it is polluted, that it is deficient in food, or it may simply need restocking. There are remedies for all these defects. Refuse from factories, the common cause of pollution, can be disposed of at a profit by manufacturers. Minnows can be raised by the million and released in the streams and lakes, and depleted waters can be restocked with fish propagated at the hatcheries.

The same judgment is required in raising fish that must be exercised in raising plants and livestock. It is a paying investment in agriculture to have the soil tested when there is doubt as to what is needed to produce a desired crop. In fish culture we have in the past been content with restocking and have paid little or no attention to stream conditions. As a result considerable effort has been wasted and we have failed to accomplish much permanent good. In order to make them produce the maximum amount of food our streams and lakes need attention the same as our fields. After exhausting the soil of eastern farms many of the owners moved westward. Now, they are coming back and reclaiming the soil they left and are making it fruitful to a truly remarkable extent. Our streams have been neglected as the soil of our eastern farms was neglected, but it is not too late to reclaim them if immediate action is taken.

#### FOOD FOR FISH AN IMPORTANT REQUISITE

Streams and lakes which otherwise form a suitable environment for fish are frequently found to be deficient in a food supply. Plants feed on the gases inimical to fish life and turn these gases into the oxygen so essential to it. Plants attract insects which constitute a most desirable natural food for fish. The black bass has a ravenous appetite for live food, and if he can not get it from other living organisms around him he will prey upon his own kind.

Some 8 or 10 years ago a man in Ohio wrote the Bureau of Fisheries that with the view of attracting insect life to his pond he had placed over it an electric light; that since its installation the large bass in the pond frequently jumped a foot or more out of the water to catch insects. Later this method of attracting insects was adopted by the Kansas fisheries authorities and has proved quite successful. Electric wires were strung over a system of ponds where channel catfish are reared and a number of bulbs suspended near the water, a single push button controlling the system. The lights were found to attract myriads of insects, many of which strike the water and are quickly snapped up by numerous small catfish. Fed in this way it is said that channel catfish grow twice as large as those subsisting on the ordinary food found in the water with the addition of clam and cornmeal porridge, etc. Any method that will attract insects to waters where fish are being raised may be considered desirable.

In order to provide a source of food supply for young fish, goldfish breeders near Frederick, Md., draw the water from their breeding ponds in the fall, manure and plow the soil, omitting potash, and with the approach of the breeding season in the spring they transfer the brood fish from their winter quarters to these ponds to spawn.

Dr. G. C. Embury, of Cornell University, who has conducted some interesting experiments in cultivating live food for fish, breeds mosquitoes in a system of pools and releases the larvae in ponds to be eaten by small fish. He is able by this means to hold the mosquitoes under complete control.

Nearly all of the bait minnows belong to the Cyprinidae, a large family of vegetation-feeding fish which includes the carp. These minnows afford a practical means of quickly converting plant life into live food for fish, and in cases where the food problem must be reckoned with it is advisable to stock small ponds in the environs of streams and lakes with such desirable minnows as the shiner and sand perch and use their progeny as fish food.

The time will doubtless come when we shall find it feasible to produce the lower forms of life in large quantities to serve as a natural food for bass and trout and when every cubic foot of water will be utilized to add to the human food supply. This is the prevailing condition to-day in Europe, where aquaculture is practiced on a large scale and salable plants and fish are raised in the same body of water.

#### REFUGES AND BREEDING GROUNDS

Lakes or ponds where selected individuals can be protected and the young allowed to escape into adjacent streams would doubtless furnish the necessary protection to the brood stock of our game fishes. To



hold brood fish in streams not subject to severe freshets 10 or 20 acres could be fenced off with poultry netting of a mesh small enough to retain the adults but large enough to permit the small fish to escape into the open waters. The brood stock could be released each year and new stock selected from the stream, the pound being moved occasionally to insure a reasonable supply of natural food at all times.

Of course, if a lake of 10 acres or more could be constructed on waste land, thereby adding to the water area of a stream, it would prove ideal for the breeding of fish. It is usually quite expensive, however, to develop a project of this kind even where natural conditions are favorable. On account of the expense involved most of the lakes constructed for fish culture have been comparatively small, and for that reason they have not been highly successful financially. Experience has shown that bass require large water areas and that it is practically useless to attempt to raise them in small inclosures.

Fish refuges, lakes, and ponds should be placed under the supervision of a responsible person to insure against the illegal removal of their occupants. Waters should be carefully studied to determine which ones can be used most effectively as breeding grounds. The term "fish refuge" implies a section of a stream that has been set aside for breeding grounds on account of its favorable environment.

#### A NOVEL METHOD OF OBTAINING BROOD FISH

That popular game fish, the black bass, and also other species, may be caught with hook and line and transported to a reasonable distance. If hooked in the mouth and the hook carefully removed, the fish are not wounded to the extent that they will not make good breeders, but if a fish swallows the hook its vital parts are liable to be injured in the process of removing it. A pall of shallow water is all that is necessary for conveying fish a reasonable distance, as a large fish—especially a bass—will keep the water agitated sufficiently to provide the necessary aeration for a trip of a few hours duration. In fact, a 4-pound bass would not need more than 2 gallons of water in a vessel 12 or 14 inches in diameter to insure its successful transportation for a few hours and possibly longer, provided the water temperature was not too high.

Would it be too much to ask fisheries organizations to cooperate in obtaining brood stock, each angler to furnish two selected individuals for breeders at the beginning of a season, such fish to be placed in an ideal environment for the renewal of the supply in a stream? The idea entails infinite possibilities and seems worthy of a trial. The matter of obtaining brood bass, crappie, and bluegill has constituted a serious problem at practically every hatchery in the United States, whether operated by the Federal Government, a State, or by private individuals.

#### IMPROVING THE SPECIES

Since fish will not thrive if held for more than a few years in ponds it follows that there is little opportunity to improve the species at a permanently established fish-cultural station, and it is not always possible to secure new stock when needed. Even goldfish breeders find it necessary to exchange stock and purchase new breeders frequently in order to maintain or improve the quality of their fish. Fish deteriorate or run out similar to sheep or other animals if left too long in a limited area.

At the beginning of a season the fish possessing the highest aggregate of good points should be selected to breed from. Brewer's law of selection can be advantageously applied in the breeding of fish in streams. The relative value of the species may also be changed and the form modified to suit the taste of anglers. We breed our best animals by selection, and is it not reasonable to infer from this fact that by annually selecting the largest and gamest bass for breeders we might eventually produce a superbass, one that would furnish an undreamed-of kick?

#### PRACTICAL FISH CONSERVATION

Many anglers are in the game for the sport it furnishes. Frequently they catch fish, take their measurements, enlarge on the measurements a little, and return the fish to the waters only to be caught by other anglers who may not be so considerate. It is believed that the average angler would be willing to contribute an occasional fish from his catch to assist in maintaining the brood stock, thereby furthering the great work of conservation. The plan in brief calls upon the anglers of the country to turn over a few adult fish for the purpose of maintaining the supply in the waters and thus assist in one of the most difficult problems connected with the propagation of black bass. The States would be asked to set aside pounds or refuges where the fish could be adequately protected until after the close of the breeding season, when they would be released. The selection of sites for such refuges would require an expert knowledge of aquatic biology and the question of a food supply and immunity of the site from the natural enemies of fish would also have to be given careful study, but consider the results that might be attained from such a course. Under favorable conditions one brood bass will produce from 6,000 to 8,000 fry and in a refuge, with proper care, one-third of these should attain legal size for catching. If by systematically pursuing such a course one fisherman can increase the supply of bass by 2,500 or even 500 individuals an-

nually would this not prove a solution of the bass problem? As eggs of commercial fish are purchased from fishermen, it would be perfectly feasible to pay the angler a fixed price for any brood stock obtained from him.

Summing up the proposition, we have provided for (1) selected brood stock obtained without robbing the streams; (2) ponds, lakes, or refuges where all fishing is prohibited; (3) open waters with fishing allowed under well-regulated restrictions. The entire plan could be placed on an established basis by one organization working in cooperation with either the Federal or a State Government.

After being in constant use for two or three years, fish refuges could be thrown open for public fishing, but before doing this new refuges should be started at other points, so that the work of conservation might proceed uninterruptedly. Planning in this way a new refuge would be established each year and an old one thrown open for public fishing, thereby insuring the continuance of good fishing.

Fisheries organizations, rod and gun clubs, and conservation associations, including in their membership business men, professional men, and mechanics, banded together for the protection and propagation of wild life, annually collect large sums of money which they use in the improvement of local streams and lakes, purchase of birds for the stocking of game preserves, food for wild birds, etc. To many an organization of this kind the Federal Government and also the States are indebted, not only for material assistance rendered in the stocking of public waters but for developing and fostering a sentiment favoring the enforcement of the fisheries laws. Fisheries organizations are in a position to render incalculable aid in carrying out the conservation scheme outlined, as they would have no difficulty in assembling sufficient brood fish every year for the maintenance of the local supply.

#### BENEFITS DERIVED FROM ANGLING

Fishing is engaged in by more of our population than is hunting, probably for the reason that it is at its height during the vacation period, and, besides, women and children who do not wish to hunt often go fishing. The apostolic calling, therefore, possesses more lure than the pastime of Nimrod. Fishing attracts people to isolated sections that they would otherwise not visit.

The benefits derived from fishing can not be estimated. Some States have attempted to place a value on their inland fisheries, taking into consideration the financial returns that accrue annually from the sale of fishing tackle, railroad transportation, hotel receipts from tourists, and commercial value of the product, all of which amount to millions of dollars. These values, however, are estimated in dollars and cents and the unknown quantity which is the most important of all is the bringing of the population into contact with nature at a time when nature is at her best and the tired business man at his worst. The inspiration received from fishing and its effect on the social and economic life of the country is more than the value of the product taken. Fishermen learn patience, as fish can not be forced to take the bait. Most fishermen are true conservationists, fishing for the recreation and paying very little attention to the value of the product taken. Indeed, many of them return the fish to the waters from which they were taken.

I have a great deal of confidence in and respect for the angler. It has been said that fishermen are a good-for-nothing class, but it is not true. Angling is one of the most wholesome recreations and anglers are the most patient and considerate class of people we have. As the milk woman said to Walton, "They be such civil and quiet men." The angler gets a thrill that comes in no other way. He feels the very heartbeats of nature, and nature is at her best when fishing is good. Fish can not be prodded, can not be coaxed; you just have to sit there and wait. If you have patience, the reward is yours.

"Oh, it's lovely when they're running  
And they're hungry and they're fine,  
And they strike and keep on tugging  
On your bait and on your line;  
But the fellow that's worth praising  
And that has the record right  
Is the lad that keeps on fishing  
When—the fish—don't—bite."

It was fishing that gave us our first actual experience with life, its ups and downs, its successes and failures. We have learned to keep on fishing, even though the fish do not bite, and this persistence instilled into us in youth has enabled us to continue on hoping for success and sometimes attaining it when otherwise we might give up. I believe it is for the reason that fishermen are open-minded that they have figured so largely in progressive movements in the history of the world. They have learned how to bear with adversity and take advantage of an opportune moment.

"Who bides his time and fevers not  
In the hot race that none achieves,  
Shall wear cool-wreathen laurel, wrought  
With crimson berries in the leaves;  
And he shall reign a goodly king,  
And sway his hand o'er every clime,  
With peace writ on his signet ring,  
Who bides his time."

As a pastime and character builder angling has no equal; so every youth should have an opportunity to experience the pleasures and adversities of fishing.

I take the view that good fishing is the culmination of a number of conditions that are essential for agriculture, manufacturing, and other lines of industry; that it is the resultant of conditions ideal for the conservation of our resources, the key to conservation. The conditions favorable for fish life in streams are conducive to a liberal supply of game on land. The requirements for good fishing are unpolluted waters, an even flow, and plenty of natural food. Forests and lakes, the prime essentials for land mammals and migratory birds, are needed to produce the conditions favorable for fish; so good fishing is the star to which the conservationist can safely hitch his wagon. Conditions that will replenish waters with desirable forms of fish life will benefit the country as a whole. The system that will produce the results must combine conservation with common sense, practical science with practical fish culture, and have the support of the various game and fisheries organizations of the country. Under such a system will the hunter bring in bags of game and the angler strings of fish. The future of fish and game rests largely with the sportsmen.

#### POSTPONEMENT OF A SENATE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 is similar to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11, which has already been passed. The Chair announces, therefore, that the consideration of the Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 is indefinitely postponed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BELL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days on account of important business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 6, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, January 6, 1928, as reported by clerks of the several committees:

##### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10 a. m.)

Independent offices appropriation bill.

(10.30 a. m.)

War Department appropriation bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2

(10.30 a. m.)

Concerning the election of JAMES M. BECK as a Representative from Pennsylvania (H. Res. 9).

##### COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Senator BRATTON and Representative MORROW, of New Mexico, and members of the Mississippi River Commission discuss projects proposed to control the flood waters of the Mississippi River.

##### COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact (H. R. 5773).

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To promote the unification of carriers engaged in interstate commerce (H. R. 5641).

##### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A meeting to hear Admiral Magruder.

##### COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

(10 a. m.)

Joint meeting in the office of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

For the relief of taxpayers having suits against Juan G. Gallardo, treasurer of Porto Rico, for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of taxes imposed by the laws of Porto Rico, pending in the Supreme Court of Appeals for the First Circuit and in the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, affected by the act of March 4, 1927, amending the

act of March 2, 1917, as amended by the act of June 7, 1924 (H. R. 6474).

For the relief of certain Porto Rican taxpayers (S. 754).

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

272. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$2,000 for the relief of Enriqueta Koch y de Jeanneret, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 343. A bill to amend section 128, subdivision (b), paragraph 1, of the Judicial Code as amended February 13, 1925, relating to appeals from district courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6057. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to appoint an additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4702. A bill to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin S. McHenry; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6005. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Boyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6839. A bill to remove the charge of desertion against Israel Brown and to grant him an honorable discharge; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6917. A bill to correct the military record of Sylvester De Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7227. A bill for the relief of William H. Dotson; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7228. A bill for the relief of Frederick Leininger; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7229. A bill for the relief of Henry Simons; without amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FURLOW: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7397. A bill authorizing the President to order Richard B. Barnitz before a retiring board for a hearing of his case and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOYLAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7553. A bill for the relief of James Neal; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7779. A bill for the relief of William H. Wagoner; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7992. A bill for the relief of Sally Mattie Macready, widow of Edward Daniel Macready; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8190. A bill for the relief of John G. Cassidy; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1534. A bill to correct the military record of John Dewitt Marvin; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.



## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to Mollie B. Gore; Committee on Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6563) granting a pension to Oscar W. Clark; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5292) for the relief of Mattie Holcomb; Committee on Claims discharged and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6806) granting a pension to Samantha Elliott; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 8523) to promote consolidation and cooperation in the mining and marketing of bituminous coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 8524) to regulate and fix rates of pay for certain employees of the Bureau of Standards; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 8525) to exempt the United States Military Academy from the provisions of section 3648, Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 8526) to establish a minimum area for a Shenandoah National Park, for administration, protection, and general development by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8527) conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the charterer of the steamship *Trontolite* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 8528) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, to certain widows, minor children, helpless children, and dependent parents of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8529) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine questions of law involved in the alleged erroneous collection of tonnage taxes in 1920 and 1921 on three vessels operated by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, under bareboat charter from a Danzig corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 8530) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River, near Cedar Bluff, in Cherokee County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8531) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across the Coosa River on the Columbiana-Talladega road between Talladega and Shelby Counties, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8532) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887 (24 Stat. L. p. 355); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8533) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8534) to discontinue certain reports now required by law to be made to Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 8535) for the award of the air-mail flyer's medal of honor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8536) to amend section 11 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8537) for the relief of retired and transferred members of the Naval Reserve Force, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8538) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a narcotic prison hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 8539) granting a license to the Vicksburg Bridge & Terminal Co. to cross the Vicksburg National Military Park at Vicksburg, Warren County, Miss.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 8540) to amend the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 8541) to provide equal pensions for Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8542) to provide for the construction of a hospital at Fort Bidwell Indian School, California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8543) to provide for the construction of a school building at Fort Bidwell Indian School, California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 8544) to provide for the protection of municipal watersheds within the national forests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 8545) to provide a 1-cent postal rate on local letters and expedite the handling of that class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8546) authorizing an appropriation of \$2,500 for the erection of a tablet or marker at Lititz, Pa., to commemorate the burial place of 110 American soldiers who were wounded in the Battle of Brandywine and died in the military hospital at Lititz; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 8547) providing for the increase of the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 8548) to refer the claims of the Loyal Creek Indians to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEWTON: A bill (H. R. 8549) to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8550) to amend the national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8551) to create an additional judge in the district of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8552) authorizing the paving of the Federal strip known as International Street, adjacent to Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8553) to provide for the destruction and eradication of predatory animals in the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8554) to amend the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. L. 1217; sec. 980, title 10, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8555) to authorize district courts of the United States to provide for reports of misdemeanor cases by United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8556) to facilitate disposition of the business of United States district courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 8557) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8558) relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 8559) to amend section 58 of the act of March 2, 1917, entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8560) to make more adequate provisions for pensions for members of the permanent military and naval service of the United States, their widows and dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 8561) to provide for the conduct of scientific investigations by the Forest Service to discover economically practical methods of the disposal of the waste materials of pulp and paper mills without polluting

streams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8562) appropriating for Menominee Indians out of their funds to enable them to work their lands, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8563) authorizing payment of interest on certain refunded purchase moneys; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 8564) providing for the conducting of silvicultural protection, economic, range, and other research at the Northern Rocky Mountain Forest Experiment Station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8565) to authorize leave of absence for departmental employees under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 8566) to amend an act entitled, "An act to provide for the appointment of Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, as warrant officers, United States Army," approved April 27, 1927; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 8567) to amend section 29 of the act of March 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," and for the insertion of a new section in said act between sections 29 and 30 of said act, to be designated as "29½" of said act; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) making provision for the improvement of the national memorial to George Washington in the District of Columbia by the erection of a suitable base; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOLADAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 129) for the appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 130) authorizing additional appropriation for memorial building to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia in the World War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BUTLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131) providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine S-4 and upon methods and appliances for the protection of submarines; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 132) to authorize the erection in Anadarko, Okla., of a monument to Black Beaver; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PRAATT: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 133) providing for the issuance of a special stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the government of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) to grant permission for the erection of a memorial statue of Cardinal Gibbons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CURRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 135) for the relief of special disbursing agents of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Territories.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8569) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 8570) granting an increase of pension to Esther L. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 8571) granting an increase of pension to Lenora Lowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACK of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8572) for the relief of the legal representatives of Michael Mayers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOIES: A bill (H. R. 8573) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. McLeran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 8574) for the relief of Thomas Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8575) for the relief of Thomas Gaffney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8576) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8577) granting a pension to Viva White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 8578) granting a pension to Edith Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 8579) for the relief of Gabriel Mead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 8580) granting an increase of pension to Angeline R. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUSHONG: A bill (H. R. 8581) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8582) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Lacey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8583) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca E. Lentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8584) granting an increase of pension to Helen A. E. Witman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8585) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8586) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8587) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8588) granting a pension to Alice Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAREW: A bill (H. R. 8589) for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8590) for the relief of Nicholas Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLEY: A bill (H. R. 8591) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Lawler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 8592) granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Harlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8593) granting an increase of pension to America Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8594) granting a pension to Sallie Bloodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8595) granting a pension to George Bunch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8596) for the relief of Homer N. Horine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMBS: A bill (H. R. 8597) for the relief of Ernest L. Silvers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8598) for the relief of James J. Dower; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 8599) for the relief of George D. Vedder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 8600) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Stutzman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8601) for the relief of William J. Hopkins; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8602) for the relief of John B. Evans; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 8603) granting an increase of pension to Martha Schmelzle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) granting an increase of pension to Susan Piggott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to James H. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8606) granting an increase of pension to Chloe Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8607) granting a pension to Nellie Snapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8608) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 8609) for the relief of J. H. Muus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to John Vetter; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 8611) for the relief of the First National Bank of Santa Maria, State of California; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8612) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8613) granting an increase of pension to John E. Lagle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8614) granting an increase of pension to James C. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) granting a pension to Liviana Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 8616) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Doughty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 8617) providing compensation to M. J. Harbinson for injuries sustained while in the Government service at and on the Belknap Reservation, Mont., engaged as a moundsman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8618) granting an increase of pension to John D. Harrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLADAY: A bill (H. R. 8619) granting a pension to Eliza A. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8620) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Avery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 8621) for the relief of the estates of John Frazer, deceased; Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; John Bunch, deceased; Jehu Underwood, deceased; and Stephen Vanzandt, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8622) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Brownell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 8623) granting an increase of pension to Minerva J. Raybell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 8624) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8625) granting a pension to Ruth McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8626) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8627) for the relief of John Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8628) for the relief of Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 8629) granting an increase of pension to Emmer A. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8630) granting a pension to William J. Keister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8631) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe J. Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8632) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFERS: A bill (H. R. 8633) for the relief of Mary Kent; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 8634) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8635) granting an increase of pension to Morris E. Leighty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8636) granting an increase of pension to Esther Van Buskirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8637) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Boes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8638) granting a pension to Katherine Raney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 8639) granting an increase of pension to Delia Lammers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8640) granting a pension to Cordelia Van Dorsten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8641) granting an increase of pension to Jessie W. Leclere; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8642) for the relief of William W. Woodruff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 8643) for the relief of William Taylor Coburn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8644) granting a pension to Blanche L. Waterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8645) granting a pension to Alamanza Korse; to the Committee on Pensions. Also, a bill (H. R. 8646) granting a pension to Frances Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8647) granting a pension to Rebecca Jane Gouge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 8648) for the relief of Anna Osburg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8649) granting a pension to Sarah A. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 8650) for the relief of C. S. Winans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8651) for the relief of Lynn W. Franklin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 8652) granting an increase of pension to Jane Louise Tymeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8653) granting an increase of pension to Alice Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8654) granting a pension to Thomas Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8655) granting a pension to Lydia Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 8656) for the relief of Harry E. Craven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8657) granting a pension to Mary J. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8658) granting a pension to Laura Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8659) granting an increase of pension to William Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8660) granting an increase of pension to Addie Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8661) granting an increase of pension to Alice O'Hearn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8662) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8663) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Breen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8664) granting a pension to Tillie D. Entrikin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8665) granting a pension to Eugene Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROXBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 8666) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8667) granting an increase of pension to Useba McMullen Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 8668) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Roche; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Anna Houghtlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8670) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8671) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to Ethel L. Saunders; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) to correct the naval record of William E. Adams; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 8673) for the relief of Edward F. Weiskopf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Lester Cooley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 8675) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Hallock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8676) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Goodsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8677) granting an increase of pension to Maggie M. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8678) granting an increase of pension to Ann S. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8681) granting an increase of pension to Jennie S. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to Ella S. Lormore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8683) granting an increase of pension to Elvira Paulman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8684) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Van Tuyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) granting an increase of pension to Delia L. Maricle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8686) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Tongue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting an increase of pension to Anna S. Givens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) granting a pension to Margaret A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 8689) granting a pension to Josie Duval; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 8690) for the relief of John F. White and Mary L. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) for the relief of Helen Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 8692) granting an increase of pension to Hettie C. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8693) granting a pension to Cinderella I. McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Sina B. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8695) granting an increase of pension to John Son; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8696) granting a pension to Frank Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8697) granting a pension to Minerva J. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Raburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8699) granting a pension to Margaret Gillfollan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8700) granting an increase of pension to Susannah M. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8701) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Purvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8702) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8703) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Maxfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8704) granting a pension to James O. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Rinda Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8706) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8707) granting an increase of pension to Mary Vanover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8708) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) granting a pension to James H. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 8710) granting an increase of pension to Roseann Minges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 8711) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 79) to provide for a temporary assistant majority floor manager of telephones; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1, of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

696. Petition of citizens of the District of Columbia, opposing the Lankford Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

697. By Mr. ADKINS: Petitions of citizens of the State of Illinois, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill, nor any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's Day, and protesting especially against the proposed legislation in House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

698. By Mr. BOYLAN: Petition protesting against compulsory Sunday observance by citizens of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

699. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of 61 citizens of Burlington, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

700. Also, petition of Mr. Howard B. Rice and 27 other citizens of St. Albans, Sheldon, Swanton, and Highgate, Vt., urging that Congress do not pass the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

701. Also, petition of Fred L. Walker and 16 other citizens of Rutland, Bristol, and West Rutland, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

702. Also, petition of H. H. Everest and 16 other citizens of West Rutland and Clarendon, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

703. Also, petition of Dr. Edward J. Rogers and 24 other citizens of Pittsford, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

704. Also, petition of L. A. Armstrong and nine other citizens of Vergennes, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

705. Also, petition of W. E. Tatro and 13 other citizens of Enosburg Falls, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

706. Also, petition of citizens of Cambridge and Fletcher, Vt., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

707. By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of citizens of Shawano County, Wis., protesting against House bill 78 and all other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

708. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Ethel W. Meek, Anne M. Ryder, and others, of Providence, R. I., protesting against any law which would bring about compulsory Sunday observance, and particularly against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

709. By Mr. BURTNESS: Fifteen petitions signed by residents of the first congressional district, North Dakota, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

710. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of citizens of Madison, Lake County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

711. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of Mrs. Marietta Bare and 78 other citizens of North Vernon, Ind., asking relief for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans by increasing pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

712. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the committee on legislation and taxation of the California Bankers' Association, protesting against the exemption up to \$300 now permitted on deposits or dividends on stock of building and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

713. Also, petition of Oakland (Calif.) Council, No. 12, Daughters of America, urging the passage of more stringent immigration laws; to the committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

714. Also, petition of the California Development Association, praying for adequate appropriations for the United States Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

715. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance signed by 100 constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

716. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance signed by 16 constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

717. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by about 50 residents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

718. Also, petition from about 40 constituents of Toledo, Ohio, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

719. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by constituents of Holland and Maumee, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

720. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by 30 constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

721. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

722. Also, petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by residents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



723. By Mr. CLARKE: Petition of the citizens of Oxford, Norwich, and Guilford, N. Y., against compulsory Sunday observance; also from citizens of Binghamton and vicinity against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

724. Also, petition from the citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., and vicinity against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

725. Also, petition of the people of Union, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

726. Also, petition of the citizens of Oxford, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

727. Also, petition of the citizens of Endicott, N. Y., and vicinity, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

728. Also, petition of the citizens of Binghamton, against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

729. By Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Petition from sundry residents of Reno, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

730. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of Marienville, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

731. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of certain citizens of Racine County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

732. Also, petition of certain citizens of Waukesha County, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

733. Also, petition of certain citizens of Rock County, Wis., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

734. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Wesley Irwin and 28 other residents of Port Huron, Mich., protesting against the enactment of any and all religious laws favoring one day of the week in preference to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

735. By Mr. DEMPSEY: Petition of citizens of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against so-called Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

736. By Mr. DRIVER: Petition signed by citizens of Jonesboro, protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

737. By Mr. ESLICK: Petition of Rev. J. W. Dement, Chancellor T. B. Lytle, and others against passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

738. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of more than 500 citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

739. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of 305 persons of Memphis, Tenn., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

740. By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: Petition of Eldon Wellington and 89 other citizens and voters of Anglaize County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Sunday observance law, as the same gives preference to one religion above another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

741. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Shelby County, Ohio, protesting against House bill 78, for Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

742. Also, petition of Daughters of America, No. 28, Greenville, Ohio, supporting House bill 3; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

743. Also, petition of Allen Council, No. 347, Junior Order United American Mechanics, supporting House bill 3; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

744. Also, petition of Allen County (Ohio) Farmer's League, opposing appropriations for corn borer eradication; to the Committee on Agriculture.

745. By Mr. FOSS: Petition of Mrs. F. C. Grove and various other citizens of Athol, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

746. Also, petition of Robert H. Dodge and 200 other citizens of Leicester, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill

78, known as the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

747. Also, petition of Rolden A. Sheldon and 102 other residents of Athol, Mass., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

748. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 568 citizens of Canyon County, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78 or any compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

749. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the adult citizens of Newkirk, Okla., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, especially of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

750. Also, petition of approximately 120 residents of Cimarron County, Okla., and adjacent counties, urging, as part of a flood-control program, the construction of a dam across the Cimarron River somewhere along said stream in Cimarron County, Okla., the exact location to be determined by engineers and experts of and for the United States Government; to the Committee on Flood Control.

751. Also, letter signed by Harold J. McCarthy, commander Veterans of Foreign Wars, N. M. Casual Post, No. 614, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; Chris A. Weros, commander Chester L. Thompson Post, No. 23, American Legion, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; and Albert M. Moriarity, commander Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., indorsing the statutory award in the amount of \$50 per month for arrested tuberculars, protesting against any interpretation of such law as being class legislation, and against certain other courses of action rumored to be contemplated by the central office of the Veterans' Bureau, and suggesting the advisability of mandating by law that a representative from each of the three organizations, viz. American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, work in conjunction with Director Hines and his medical staff in promulgating and putting into effect any and all rules and regulations that affect the disabled; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

752. Also, letter from Frederick M. Hohmann, N. S., Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against discrimination in existing laws against Spanish-American War veterans who contracted disabilities during period of their service and are pensioned under the general law; to the Committee on Pensions.

753. By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Harlingen, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

754. Also, petition of citizens of Pharr, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

755. Also, petition of citizens of Medina County, Tex., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

756. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of residents of Springfield, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

757. Also, petition of residents of Lyndonville, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

758. Also, petition of residents of Jamaica, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

759. Also, petition of residents of Brattleboro, Vt., and vicinity, in opposition to proposed legislation for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

760. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of H. C. Keacher and 67 other residents of Chisago County, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

760½. Also, petition of William H. Armstrong and 39 others, residents of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

761. Also, petition of Mrs. Bettie Carlson and 18 others, residents of Wayzata, Maple Plain, and Long Lake, in the State of Minnesota, protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

762. Also, petition of Esther S. Strand and 108 other residents of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting the enactment into

law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

763. Also, petition of A. F. Garner and 39 other residents of Sandstone and Hinckley, Minn., protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

763½. Also, petition of Karl R. Schenck and 27 other residents of Bruno, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

764. Also, petition of Elmer T. Blost and 47 other residents of Pine City, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

765. Also, petition of Daniel Gordon and 56 others of the city of Minneapolis, protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

766. Also, petition of H. M. Johnston and 76 others, of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

767. Also, petition of E. W. Adams and 43 others, of Pine County, Minn., protesting the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

768. Also, petition of Mrs. Steuart L. MacDougall and 109 others, of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the enactment into law of House bill 78, the Lankford bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

769. Also, petition of Mrs. Amanda Westman and seven others, residents of Anoka County, Minn., protesting against House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday observance bill, being enacted into law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

770. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Cloister Post 429, American Legion, Ephrata, Pa., requesting the support of Representatives in upholding the statutory provision for \$50 per month paid to beneficiaries for arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

771. Also, petition of R. F. Keppel & Bro. (Inc.), Lancaster, Pa., unqualifiedly indorsing the Capper-Kelly fair trade bill (H. R. 11); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

772. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Ebersole, Elizabethtown, Pa., not to pass House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

773. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of a number of residents of King County, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

774. Also, petition of a number of residents of Everett, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

775. Also, petition of a number of residents of Auburn, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

776. Also, petition of a number of residents of Langley, Wash., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

777. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 17 citizens of Rochester, Center Conway, North Conway, and Bartlett, N. H., protesting against the passage of any legislation tending toward compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

778. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., in opposition to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

779. By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of citizens of Dover-Foxcroft, South Brewer, Newport, Plymouth, and Stockholm, Me., urging nonpassage of Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

780. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of Charles Williams and 84 other residents of Branch County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

781. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Miss Lill Dinkens, Tekamah, Nebr., and others of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

782. Also, petition signed by L. E. Reed, Chapman, Nebr., and others of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of

House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

783. Also, petition signed by Mrs. G. Goble, Royal, Nebr., and other citizens of that vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 and all other proposed legislation to provide for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

784. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of the sixth congressional district of Michigan, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

785. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of residents of Sagola and other towns, State of Michigan, with reference to House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

786. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 22 citizens of Gallia County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

787. Also, petition signed by 51 residents of Gallia County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

788. Also, petition signed by 21 citizens of Jackson County, Ohio, protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

789. By Mr. KADING: Petition signed by 215 citizens of Beaver Dam, Wis., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

790. By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of 438 residents of Decatur, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

791. Also, petition of Mr. E. M. Phillips and 185 other residents of Benton Harbor, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

792. Also, petition of Mr. L. A. Seymour and 27 other residents of Glen, Grand Junction, and Lactoa, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

793. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of residents of Franklin and Medway, Mass., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

794. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petitions from the citizens of Cleveland, Bradley County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

795. Also, petitions from the citizens of the towns of Decherd, Sewanee, Monteagle, and Tracy City, Franklin and Grundy Counties, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

796. Also, petitions from the citizens of Warren County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

797. Also, petition from the citizens of Polk County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

798. Also, petitions from the citizens of Hamilton County, Tenn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

799. By Mr. MAPES: Petition of numerous adult citizens of Kent County, Mich., against the passage of House bill 78, or any other compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

800. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. F. Lapham and 35 other residents of Mansfield, Mass., protesting against enactment of compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

801. Also, petition of Byron P. Hardy and 72 other residents of Attleboro, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

802. Also, petition of Mrs. Clifford Turner and 42 other residents of Mansfield, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

803. Also, petition of Ellery Robinson and 60 other residents of Bristol County, Mass., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



804. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition in opposition to House bill 78, signed by E. O. Thomas, Harry E. Merfield, and 38 others; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

805. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

806. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of 125 citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

807. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by A. B. Meyer and numerous other citizens of Jamestown, Mo.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

808. By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition signed by T. C. Bright and others, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

809. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, indorsing the immigration act of 1924, with certain revisions to the various quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

810. By Mr. PORTER: Petition of National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, demanding additional immigration restriction, enactment of alien deportation law, alien registration law, and better naturalization laws, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

811. By Mr. PRALL: Petition received from C. S. Countryman, Staten Island, N. Y., with 370 signatures protesting against the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

812. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of Nelson W. Hartwick and 15 other residents of Bloomfield, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78 or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

813. By Mrs. ROGERS: Petition of Maude Marsh and other adult citizens of Lowell, Chelmsford, and North Chelmsford, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

814. Also, petition of A. F. Hitchings and other citizens of Hudson, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

815. Also, petition of Henry C. Gates and other adult residents of the towns of Hudson, Gleasondale, and Medfield, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

816. Also, petition of Charles H. Sawyer and other adult citizens of Hudson, Bolton, and Sterling, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

817. Also, petition of Al Arlinsky and others of Lowell, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

818. Also, petition of John J. Whelton and others, of Lowell, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

819. Also, petition of Henry A. Derby and others, of Lowell and Dracut, Mass., against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

820. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of E. D. Manning, Dave Bowen, and others, of Queen City, Mo., in opposition to the passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

821. By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

822. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, urging that the Federal Government assume all expense in the Mississippi River flood-control problem; to the Committee on Flood Control.

823. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., protesting passage of compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

824. Also, petition of citizens of Brea, Calif., and other communities, protesting passage of compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

825. Also, petition of citizens of San Diego County, Calif., and other communities protesting passage compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

826. Also, petition of citizens of West Minister, Calif., and other communities, protesting passage compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

827. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Mrs. J. T. Marr and 11 other citizens of Marietta, Ga., protesting against the enact-

ment of compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

828. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Defiance, Ohio, protesting against the passage of legislation for the compulsory observance of Sunday, or adoption of any resolution or bill to give preference to one religion above another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

829. By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of Mrs. J. W. Hurd and other citizens of Decatur, Ark., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

830. Also, petition of J. Price Rouloe, D. L. Harris, and many other citizens of Benton County, Ark., asking for the passage of the bill to establish a national military park at the Elk Horn, or Pea Ridge, battle field, in Benton County, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

831. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of 66 citizens of Osceola, Clarke County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of a compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

832. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of various citizens of Henderson County, N. C., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

833. Also, petition of various citizens of Asheville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

834. Also, petition of various citizens of Asheville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

835. Also, petition of various citizens of Cherokee County, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

836. Also, petition of various citizens of Henderson County, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

837. Also, petition of various citizens of Hendersonville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

838. By Mr. WELLER: Petition of citizens of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

839. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

840. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

841. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

842. Also, petition of numerous residents of Louisville, Ky., and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any other bill providing for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

843. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district of Michigan, in opposition to House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 6, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite God, whose throne is in the hearts of Thy loving children, wherever they are found, we thank Thee that place nor time can not separate us from Thy love. May we meditate upon Thy providences with grateful feelings, exalted hopes, and great thoughts. Allow us not to be cradled in illusions, but help us to look up and discover the golden crown which hovers above. O river of God's mercy! It is the blessing which feeds the world and by its might we shall yet find our paradise. Bless us with an irresistible yearning that sends us beyond the narrow boundaries of self and stretches our vision under wider skies. Teach us that he who overcomes self treads the world under foot. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.